



Twende Mbele

Diagnostic on the supply and demand of evaluators in Uganda, Benin and South Africa

Synthesis Report



First draft

27 June 2018



Executive Summary

Introduction

During 2017 and early 2018, Twende Mbele commissioned separate diagnostic studies on the supply and demand of evaluators in Uganda, Benin and South Africa. While the studies were separate, they had similar terms of reference. This synthesis report provides an integrated summary of the three studies. Additional detail can be found in the country-specific diagnostic reports.

Purpose

The purpose of the diagnostic studies was to provide a demand-and-supply profile of evaluators in Uganda, Benin and South Africa. On the supply side, the main aims were to quantify the size and shape of the current country supply of evaluation consultants, including their skills levels, abilities and specialisations, and pricing. On the demand side, the main aims were to quantify the current and projected demand for evaluation services, including factors such as eligibility requirements to tender, opportunities for transformation and the sustainability and strengths and weaknesses of the market. Overall, the aim was to ascertain whether supply is, and will be in the future, sufficient to meet demand, and what should be done to grow local supply.

Methodology

A similar research methodology was used in each of the countries, i.e. literature review; interviews with suppliers, clients and civil society; focus groups and workshops. In Benin a questionnaire was also distributed, and in South Africa there was an online survey as well as a root-cause analysis workshop.

Due to methodological limitations and a lack of availability of data in some cases, in all three countries it was not possible to answer some of the quantitative research questions. Nevertheless, in all three countries the diagnostic was able to produce a qualitative assessment of the ability of supply to meet demand, both currently and in the future. The diagnostic was also able to identify qualitative issues and insights into the research questions related to capacity and skills, representivity, accessibility, and pricing.

Findings

Demand-side

In Benin the demand side is 90% dominated by donors. Government demand for evaluations is relatively small and has dropped in recent years.



In Uganda there is substantial government and NGO demand in addition to donor demand. Government demand in Uganda is based on a policy requirement for all very large projects to be evaluated, and this demand is therefore fairly constant.

In South Africa there are indications that government demand could grow rapidly over the next three years, because of a non-financial incentive that has been introduced for all national and provincial government departments to carry out evaluations of their programmes. Demand from the non-government sector is also increasing in South Africa, albeit not as fast as that of government. Non-government demand is dominated by “not-for-profits” and international private foundations rather than donor countries.

In South Africa, donors play a smaller role in the evaluation market, with most evaluations being commissioned by government or by the non-government sector. This reflects the larger role played by international donors in government programmes in Uganda and Benin compared to South Africa, which funds a higher percentage of its programmes through its own fiscus.

Many of the donors prefer commissioning evaluators from their countries or regions, and this leads to much of the donor-demand being met by external suppliers. For example, it was found that in Uganda, about half of the donor-led evaluations were conducted by international evaluators only, while the other half was conducted by mixed teams, i.e. international and national evaluators. The study indicates that this is a policy preference of the donors, rather than a response to a shortage of local supply with the required capacity.

Supply-side

In all three countries it was not possible to quantitatively establish the size of the current country supply of evaluation consultants because there is no clear definition of what an ‘evaluation consultant’ is. Another factor is that some suppliers or potential suppliers can choose whether to do evaluations for certain clients or not, as they have other options for earning an income. Their availability to carry out evaluations often depends on factors such as who the client is, the track-record of the client in terms of the way in which it manages evaluations, the quality of the terms of reference and whether the budget is realistic.

In all three countries there is no comprehensive database of evaluators and evaluation consultancies. In Benin, the pool of local evaluators is largely made up of individuals. In Uganda, there is a growing number of individual consultants and consultancy organizations that have been undertaking evaluations. The universities in Uganda are endowed with highly qualified teaching and research staff, which presents good opportunities to conduct evaluations. Potential exists to build the capacities of these institutions to bridge any evaluation supply-demand gaps.



Nevertheless, in all three countries it was possible to conclude that, to date, supply has generally been adequate to meet demand, apart for some exceptions for highly specialist evaluations. In South Africa there appears to be a real risk that supply may not be able to meet demand in the next few years, due to a projected rapid increase in government evaluations. However, this is complicated by the finding that government clients might experience an apparent lack of supply which is due to suppliers choosing not to work for them because their supply management is poor, rather than being due to a real shortage of supply.

Barriers to entry

In all three countries, one of the main barriers to entry was found to be weaknesses with government capacity to formulate, procure and manage evaluations. In Benin and Uganda, the donor policy preference for international evaluators can also be a barrier to entry for local evaluators.

Improving the representivity of supply

In Benin the pool of evaluators is almost exclusively male, while in Uganda it is largely male. In addition, in both Benin and Uganda, evaluation teams are usually led by foreign consultants. The key representivity issues in these two countries are therefore gender equity and increasing local participation.

The South African study found a higher level of participation of women in the evaluation supply market. The key representivity issue in South Africa is to increase participation of black evaluators and black-owned consultancies in the supply market.

Minimum competency requirements and professionalisation

While terms of reference for evaluations in all three countries have minimum requirements in terms of experience and qualification, there has not yet been standardisation of these requirements in any of the countries. This is partly due to a lack of consensus regarding minimum competency levels.

Training

In Benin there is relatively limited capacity for training in evaluation, but to date the country has been able to generate the skills needed to meet the demand. In Uganda there is more capacity for training in evaluation, and several evaluation capacity building initiatives or programmes have been implemented. In South Africa, while there has been an increase in the numbers of public and private tertiary education institutions offering courses or modules in M&E, there are few post-graduate courses in evaluation, and these are over-subscribed. In all three countries there is clearly a need for increased training of government officials involved in the commissioning,



procurement and management of evaluations. Such training should be aimed at addressing the demand-side weaknesses identified in this diagnostic report.

Pricing

Pricing levels in Uganda and Benin appear to be similar, with average charge-out rates of approximately US\$200 to US\$300 per day, depending on qualifications, experience, and skills scarcity. In South Africa the charge-out rates are generally higher, with average charge-out rates of approximately US\$200 to US\$700, going up to US\$1400 per day.

Recommendations

The main recommendations in the report are:

1. In all three countries, there needs to be an ongoing process of strengthening the culture of evaluation.
2. The governments of the three countries should put in place and implement plans to address their demand-side shortcomings. This should include the development of procurement strategies to create a conducive environment for the growth of the local supply market; standardising experience and qualification requirements in RFQs and the evaluation process; and increased training of government evaluation managers.
3. There should be a thorough assessment of the skills gaps (as opposed to generalisations about a lack of capacity), the results of which should be fed into the training sector in each of the three countries.



Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
1. Introduction	9
1.1 Background and problem statement.....	9
1.2 Terms of reference for the diagnostics.....	10
1.3 Methodology.....	11
2. Literature and document review	15
2.1 Principles and lessons of evaluation capacity development (ECD)	15
2.2 Country-specific literature	16
3. Research findings	21
3.1 Country demand for evaluation.....	21
3.2 Characteristics of country supply.....	26
3.3 Demand-side capacity.....	42
4. Conclusions	56
4.1 Answering the research questions.....	56
4.2 The quantity of demand	56
4.3 The quantity and quality of supply	57
4.4 The quality of demand	57
4.5 Improving the representivity of supply.....	58
4.6 Minimum competency requirements and professionalisation	59
4.7 Training	59
4.8 Pricing.....	60
5. Recommendations	61
References	64





1. Introduction

1.1 Background and problem statement

Twende Mbele (TM) is a partnership programme between Benin, Uganda and South Africa, using a peer-learning approach to build stronger national evaluation systems to improve governance and accountability to citizens.

The programme is in an effective start-up phase, with five output areas:

1. Increased demand within partner countries and governments
2. Increased sharing in Africa around use of M&E for improved governance
3. Increased learning in Africa around use of M&E for improved governance
4. Specific M&E tools developed collaboratively
5. Effective and collaborative programme management, governance and operations.

Twende Mbele commissioned diagnostic studies on the supply and demand of evaluators in the three countries, after identifying the following problem statement (quoted from the ToRs for the studies):

“As more and more evaluations are being commissioned and undertaken in a number of African countries, it is clear that the current supply of good evaluators is constrained, with relatively small group of professional suppliers taking up most of the larger evaluation studies. As more governments demand more evaluative evidence, the number and quality of human resources required to meet this will grow. At the current level of demand, problems with the size of the pool of available evaluators, the quality of their deliverables and their ability to respond to government terms of reference (ToRs), consolidates an already skewed evaluation market.

There is, therefore, a need to expand the existing pool of evaluators, and to ensure that the representivity of evaluators in a given country system approximates that of the local population, as well as enabling emerging evaluators to enter the market with fewer restrictions. Each of the three countries covered here will benefit from further understanding of the incentives and barriers that foster a more competitive demand and supply in the evaluation market.

Within the framework provided by Twende Mbele, country-specific trends as well as cross-country comparisons are possible, with strong references to African and regional issues also possible. In political-economic terms, besides gender relations that are being foregrounded in DFID criteria, there is a growing recognition of the importance of broader poverty and social inequality as major determinants of current assessments of the economic winners and losers in the global social order. These critical considerations need to be factored into the thematic assessment of evaluator



demand and supply, specifically issues of transformation, obstacles to evaluation market entry, and even more challenging, notion of empowerment.”

1.2 Terms of reference for the diagnostics

The ToR for the diagnostics indicated that:

The study will answer questions around the capacity and supply of evaluators, and what is required to strengthen this capacity and supply?...

On the **supply side**, current capacity will be identified through:

- (i) size of current country supply of evaluation consultants (including government, academic, donors, business and civil society)*
- (ii) skill levels, abilities and specialisations*
- (iii) shape of the current pools of skills (age, gender, race and ethnicity, geography, language, organisation or individual, etc.)*
- (iv) pricing (relative cost) of skills and value-for-money considerations*
- (v) access to evaluators (ability and/or reach of national systems to procure required skills), (vi) other capacity considerations*

On the **demand side**, considerations to include:

- (i) national government system requirements for eligibility to provide evaluation services, and other market entry determinants*
- (ii) value of current country demand (including government, academic, donors, business and civil society)*
- (iii) specific professional skills required from evaluators*
- (iv) efficiency of country information systems on evaluator availability (supply), and opportunities (demand)*
- (v) opportunities/possibilities for transformation and country-specific empowerment*
- (vi) sustainability of the market.*

The outcomes of the diagnostic will be used to design activities to improve the supply and quality of evaluations (and evaluators).

The main research question to be answered through this study is: What do we know of the capacity and supply of evaluators, and what is required to strengthen this capacity and supply?



Additional questions are:

- 1. What is the size of the evaluation market (demand from donors, government, private sector – and in response, how big is the supply (pool of skills available)?*
- 2. How do we better match the supply to demand (especially if we are trying to increase demand)? This is the end point of the diagnostic.*
- 3. To what extent has the current approach to building an evaluation market constrained/enabled that market in each country?*
- 4. What are the current patterns of evaluation implementation using external service providers versus the use of officials/public servants in government?"*

1.3 Methodology

The terms of reference proposed the following methodology:

- i. literature and other official document review
- ii. interviews with selected key respondents (individuals and institutional representatives, including government departments and donors)
- iii. a few focus groups with selected stakeholders/role-players (e.g. government role players, NGOs, VOPEs, business etc)
- iv. an online survey targeting VOPEs or national institutions that will enable access to any existing pools of evaluators (including membership organisations, supplier databases, etc.) across all three countries.

The methodology proposed in the ToR was largely followed in the implementation of the diagnostic in each of the three countries.

Uganda

In Uganda, the methodology involved:

- an extensive review of documentation relevant to evaluation in Uganda
- the collation of and analysis of secondary data covering policy, academic and grey literature relating to the demand and supply side of evaluation
- carrying out in-depth interviews with a sample of Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), of Parliamentary officers, committees and elected officials, of training and research institutions, of donors and of civil society organizations. In particular, issues of



actual and latent demand and of evaluation capacities were explored through the interview process.

- considering primary and secondary documentation to substantiate the claims of the interviews and to expand the information base

Data collection took place in a semi-structured way that allowed people to narrate their story – with some probing taking place based upon the guiding supply and demand questions. The data from interviews was analysed qualitatively basing on the emerging relevant themes and sub-themes during the fieldwork, with emerging conclusions refined and subjected to validation during the last set of interviews.

The interviews aimed at interrogating both demand and supply side evaluation stakeholders. However, the supply side interviews provided limited information relative to the ToR. This deficit was partly filled with the help of the National Network, which allowed its members to participate in the questionnaire.

Benin

In Benin, the methodology involved:

- extensive literature review (various evaluation reports from both government and donors)
- interviews (with both supply and demand actors)
- preset questionnaires and
- participation in a workshop (launch of the government evaluation database) which allowed for results obtained to be compared with other reports (24 government evaluation reports conducted between 2006 and 2016 by The Office of Public Policy Evaluation).

Those interviewed were able to provide adequate information to establish a basis for analysis. The views of donors and civil society organizations were also solicited for the study. The questionnaire assessed the proficiency profiles, practice, quality of demand, and constraints to the practice of the profession.

The literature review looked at various evaluation reports from both government and the donor partners. Although valuable, this proved to be a limited tool. The weaknesses in the organisation of the demand-side evaluation processes, resulting in a program or service-based dispersion of the evaluation archives made it more difficult, if not impossible, to collect information on past studies. In addition, supply profile information could not be obtained.

Information on evaluations conducted by sectoral government departments was almost non-existent. Apart from the data obtained from the BEPPAAG database, no department was able to



provide information on the evaluations conducted in recent years. A similar finding, with two exceptions, occurred with donor partners as well. Apart from UNDP, which was able to show a systematic evaluation database presenting the types of evaluation, implementers and budgets allocated, no other donor was able to give a comprehensive account of past evaluations which they sponsored. Information on evaluations conducted by sectoral government departments was almost non-existent.

South Africa

In South Africa, the methodology involved:

- A literature review
- Interviews with a range of clients, suppliers and trainers
- A focus group with the national Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) procurement staff to consider approaches to the procurement of evaluations by government
- A focus group made up of government officials, evaluation suppliers, trainers and NGOs, to carry out a root cause analysis
- An online survey, aimed at four target groups, i.e. individual evaluators, organisations carrying out evaluations, and organisations which could potentially carry out evaluations on the supply side; and client bodies which commission evaluations on the demand side.

Respondents for interviews were selected through purposive sampling and snowballing sampling. The interviewees were selected based on recommendations from government officials, recommendations from other interviewees, as well as from contact details on the DPME panel of evaluators. Only a fraction of those to whom requests for interviews were sent responded and were interviewed.

All the interviewees were informed that the interviews were anonymous and that they would not be identified or directly quoted in the diagnostic report.

A structured questionnaire was developed for the interviews but in practice the interviews were unstructured and open-ended, as this method yielded better results in terms of identifying new issues and insights.

Some of the organisations interviewed play more than one role (e.g. trainer and supplier). After 11 interviews with suppliers, the point was reached where there were diminishing returns from carrying out further interviews, because few new issues were being raised.



Most of the interviewees were evaluation suppliers. Due to the limited number of suppliers interviewed compared to the total population, the findings cannot be generalised. Nevertheless, the interviews did provide some useful indications of the views of some of the market participants on both the demand and supply-side, which can be used to inform strategies to reduce the risk of supply not being able to meet demand.

The online survey was sent to all the suppliers on the DPME panel as well as suppliers who have been tendering for DPME evaluations on open tender; to all the national departments doing evaluations (according to the DPME database) and to the provincial Offices of the Premier; and the South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association (SAMEA) put out a notice requesting its members to complete the online survey, to which 44 responses were received.

Many of the issues which were raised in the interviews were also raised in the online survey.



2. Literature and document review

2.1 Principles and lessons of evaluation capacity development (ECD)

The international literature provides useful conceptual frameworks for evaluation capacity development (ECD). It also provides useful lessons based on international experience. ECD needs to be undertaken within the prevailing political economy of a country (DFID and CLEAR, 2014). While many demand and supply-side concerns are technical, the overall policy space is political, and possibilities for ECD depend on the nature of the political economy.

As pointed out by the OECD (2010), strengthening evaluation capacities involves more than just building individual technical skills; capacities also involve institutional or organisational capacities and creating an enabling environment. This means that an assessment of demand and supply for evaluation must also consider the enabling environment for supply and the organisational capacity of the demand organisations to create an appropriate enabling environment for supply. The enabling environment for supply includes a genuine willingness on the demand-side to improve programme performance in terms of outcomes and impacts, a genuine interest in evidence, and a genuine willingness to question and challenge the status quo in pursuit of improvement.

The OECD recommends that efforts to strengthen capacities should begin by taking stock of the current situation: a shared understanding of existing capacities, strengths, opportunities, needs, goals and challenges should be developed among both those on the demand side and those on the supply side. This sharing of information will also reduce the risk of market failure due to information asymmetries.

The OECD report identifies five useful lessons from the international experience of ECD:

- a) One of the most effective learning techniques is through hands-on learning by doing. Directly involving staff and officials in evaluation work can help to improve both individual capacities and the management capacities within relevant institutions, while also convincing them of the value and usefulness of evaluation.
- b) Capacity development should move beyond individual production skills to address the wider enabling environment for accountability, skills for commissioning, managing and using evaluations, and the institutional framework supporting accountability. Many ECD efforts have focused on the supply side of the question: training evaluators, producing evaluation reports, etc. with not enough attention paid to stimulating public interest in development results, management responses, beneficiary empowerment, and other factors that stimulate demand and build an active accountability environment.



- c) Evaluation needs, capacity gaps and resources should be identified and addressed early in the design and planning of development activities. Budgets and plans for development programmes should build in basic good practice for quality monitoring and evaluation and include strategies for strengthening these capacities, where needed, as part of the development intervention. 'Evaluability' and fundamental principles of planning and monitoring are rarely considered at the design and implementation stages, which makes evaluation more difficult later down the line.
- d) Regional and national evaluation associations play a critical role in strengthening and sustaining monitoring and evaluation capacities. Such networks provide opportunities for useful dialogue, interaction and learning. National evaluation organisations can serve as learning hubs, offer training and access to resources, and encourage support in communities of individuals committed to evaluation and accountable governance. Professional associations also contribute to building an enabling environment for the growth of evaluation culture.

2.2 Country-specific literature

2.2.1 *Uganda*

Over the past two decades, considerable efforts have been made to establish a strong and robust basis for assessing public spending, and its effects on development. In achieving this, M&E was enshrined in the National Development Plan and institutionalized in governance systems and processes (National Development Plan, 2010/11- 2014/15).

The Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) was given the constitutional mandate to oversee reforms and service delivery in all Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDA) and established an M&E function to support this role (National M&E Policy, 2013). It was set up to design, commission, conduct and disseminate evaluations on public policies and major public investments, as directed by the Uganda government, and to oversee improvements in the quality and utility of evaluations conducted across the government at a decentralised level. OPM works closely with evaluation networks, national and international partners and evaluation expert institutions to promote the use of evidence in policy and programme formulation and in decision-making.

A National Strategy for Monitoring and Evaluation of Government programmes (NIMES) was developed with the aim of enhancing M&E capacity as well as ensuring that sound evidence-based data and information are available to inform decision-making (The Republic of Uganda, National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy, 2006). The National Policy for Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation was developed and approved in 2013 to provide a clear



framework for strengthening the coverage, timeliness of assessment of public interventions. The policy was meant to enhance the performance of the public sector through strengthening coordination and cost-effective production and use of objective information in the implementation of national interventions. The policy enabled government, civil society organizations, development partners and corporations to access credible evidence to inform policy and programmatic decisions and hold the public sector accountable for its application of resources (National M&E Policy, 2013).

The implementation of the National Policy for Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation saw government introduce a series of reforms to enhance accountability and transparency of the Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) and Local Governments (LGs). Significant effort went into introducing planning, results-based budgets, monitoring systems and developing the institutional capacity to design ministry strategy and plans to implement M&E arrangements to monitor results and provide a basis for performance improvement as provided for in the National Development Plan (Annual Performance Assessment Report, 2013/2014).

The Office of the Prime Minister collates information from other departments and produces bi-annual and annual sector performance reports. There is a system of annual Cabinet retreats to review the performance of the government. The Prime Minister, ministers and top public servants attend the retreat. The retreats review reports and may issue recommendations to inform budgeting processes. In this way, there are mechanisms to institutionalize monitoring to feed into executive decision-making processes.

For Parliament, the Office of the Auditor General has an established evaluative practice as it carries value—for-money audits on a regular and systematic basis since 2005. There is an evaluation practice in Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) although the practice appears under-resourced, ad-hoc and driven primarily by donor requirements and support. This shows a high level of demand for M&E evidence. However, monitoring dominates the M&E systems in all cases.

There is a two-year rolling evaluation agenda, mainly donor funded and overseen by an M&E technical working group. The Government Evaluation Facility (GEF) is run by a secretariat in the Office of the Prime Minister, which provides technical support for evaluations and the evaluation system. Evaluations are more focused on implementation and impact or summative forms of evaluations. The Department of M&E/UEA in Uganda is endeavouring to set standards across government for evaluation and attempting to invoke demand for evaluation by introducing a range of tools to increase commitment by Cabinet, the Prime Minister and Sector Departments. The specific tools being applied to support this include mechanisms such as Departments proposing evaluations, development of a national evaluation agenda or plan, and making the reports publicly available.



Demand for evaluative information in, and of, the GoU, and resulting use, falls broadly into two categories: monitoring information for budget allocation and control purposes; and evaluation. The majority of the evaluations are donor initiated, funded, commissioned, managed, conducted and used primarily to meet donor accountability requirements.

The key challenges for implementing evaluation include invoking an incentive for use and demand for use from politicians and developing an adapted endogenous system that can draw on in-country quality evaluation capacity. While some limited capacity does exist for evaluation in the various public sector institutions in the country in terms of personnel and systems, the quality of practice is at variance with the standard norms that are agreed upon and used internationally.

Although there is a robust supply of evaluations and production of evaluation reports generally in Uganda, one of the constraints for use by the GoU and the public sector in general is the lack of coordination and dissemination by donors of evaluation reports they commission. There is little in the way of organized social accountability mechanisms that could generate demand as well for evaluation. Although there is general demand for accountability information from Parliament and the public in general, with the former mechanisms for implementing response and scrutiny require strengthening and linking to clear instructions to actors that should respond. With the latter, mechanisms for social accountability are insufficiently developed and organized to exert effective and focused demand for evaluation and accountability information in general.

There is however, institutionalized demand for evaluation at the national level as part of the National Development Plan (NDP) processes. There is also demand from Parliament, the Public Accounts Committee and the public in general for accountability information on GoU spending. This demand is addressed through the value for money audits of the Office of the Auditor General (OAG). The Office of the Auditor General does respond to the accountability demand of Parliament by conducting value for money audits on a systematic and regular basis.

A study was done in Uganda in June 2009 by Ian C. Davies, which found that demand for evaluative information in, and of the Government of Uganda, and resulting use, falls broadly into two categories; monitoring information for budget allocation and control purposes and; evaluation information to meet the accountability requirements. A key finding of the study was that there were significant gaps, and variances among MDAs, in organizational capacity for evaluation for the Government of Uganda (GoU).

The only source of information about available evaluators is the Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA) and the USAID funded Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services (MEMS) project that developed a roster of Ugandan institutions, firms and individual consultants for Monitoring and Evaluation Services.



2.2.2 *South Africa*

While South Africa's prevailing political economy has some patrimonial characteristics, the country also has a strong constitutional and legislative framework that supports the long-term development of evaluation (see Podems et al in Canadian Evaluation Society, 2014). However, despite this constitutional and legislative framework, a strong culture of accountability has not yet developed in South Africa. Other relevant aspects of South Africa's country context include that while it is relatively well-skilled compared to other developing countries, skills are at a premium, and the supply market is racially-skewed.

Most of the literature and documents which are specific to South Africa focus on demand related to government-initiated evaluations. It is possible to make approximate estimates of government demand using the available information in the documents and data that are available, supplemented with information from interviews.

There is very little literature or documents on the demand for evaluation from NGOs and donors in South Africa. There are databases of evaluations, but they are not useful for this study, because they are institution-specific and not country-specific (e.g. the CLEAR African Evaluation Database and the DIFID database). There is also relatively little literature and documentation on the supply market in South Africa.

South Africa has made good progress in establishing an evaluation system (Goldman et al, 2015). A national evaluation policy and national and provincial evaluation plans are in place, and departmental evaluation plans have recently started to be put in place. Evaluations in the national evaluation plan are being presented to Cabinet, and improvements plans are being implemented based on the results of many of the evaluations. Nevertheless, South Africa still has major challenges in terms of developing institutional or organisational capacities for evaluation and in creating an enabling environment for evaluation.

As indicated by Goldman et al (in World Bank, 2016), in 2012 DPME undertook a survey to assess the state of M&E in the national and provincial governments. It found that more than half of the respondents (54%) indicated that problems are not treated as opportunities for learning and improvement; 45% indicated that senior management often failed to champion M&E; 44% indicated that M&E is regarded as the job of the M&E Unit rather than of all managers; and 39% indicated that M&E units have little influence. In 57% of cases, M&E information had limited or no influence on decision-making. Nearly half of the respondents (46%) regarded integration with policy development as either non-existent or very limited. Thus, in 2012 South Africa still had a long way to go in terms of creating an enabling environment for evaluation.



Goldman et al note that these statistics point to the challenge in using M&E as a strategic function to inform policy and decision-making in South Africa. Goldman et al conclude that, in general, there has been insufficient evidence use across government, and a tendency for political judgement rather than political decisions informed by strong evidence. While such a survey has not been carried out more recently, these challenges are long-term in nature and are likely to still be present in many government departments and amongst many political leaders in South Africa.



3. Research findings

The findings are grouped according to the main research questions below.

3.1 Country demand for evaluation

3.1.1 *Uganda*

The supply of M&E in Uganda has to a large extent been influenced by donor demand that has stimulated the development of M&E practice, in the face of limited national government demand. However, there is evidence of emerging endogenous demand for evidence. This demand is sometimes being filled by Uganda-led monitoring systems, as well as evaluations that supply deeper analysis. The Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) goes beyond coordination, to information generation through evaluation.

According to the National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation (2013), all projects over 70 billion shillings (approximately US\$17.5m) in value are required to conduct rigorous evaluations, including a baseline study to establish initial conditions, a mid-term review and a final evaluation. Approximately 30% of projects are valued at over 70 billion shillings.

The cost of the three evaluations per project is between 1.5 billion to 2.5 billion shillings (approximately US\$0.5m)), which is within 4% of the total project budget of over 70 billion shillings. To finance evaluation, all projects are required to allocate a percentage of their budgets to evaluation, as determined by the Development Committee, considering the budget and scope of the project.

Public policy and major cross-sectoral evaluations are budgeted for under the Office of the Prime Minister Development budget. This requires a minimum of three billion shillings per annum, based on a cost of conducting 3 evaluations per annum at 1 billion shillings (US\$0.25m) each. Survey results showed that the average cost of an evaluation in most CSOs is Ug Shs 30 million (US\$7 500).

According to the available evidence, approximately 12% of total evaluations conducted in Uganda have been commissioned and/or co—managed by the Government of Uganda (GoU). The Government Evaluation Facility has commissioned 23 evaluations. These evaluations have generally been consistent with quality standards such as the OECD DAC evaluation quality standards. They all assess efficiency and effectiveness of programmes, performance against qualitative and quantitative indicators, etc., and they all use a mixed methods approach, i.e. literature review, stakeholder meetings, and field visits.

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in Uganda overall have a systematic approach to evaluation, e.g. regular programme performance evaluations, mainly based on donor requirements and



procedures. As such, the evaluation processes in CSOs are to a large extent driven by donors, with the evaluations being funded by donors and commissioned based on ToRs developed in collaboration with donors. Compared to government agencies, CSOs are reportedly better at following up on findings and recommendations from evaluations, due to competition for donor support in the CSO environment, meaning that there is pressure to demonstrate that they qualify for support. The CSOs' existence depends on their ability to produce results, demonstrate impact, and therefore implement the changes suggested in evaluations.

The survey of CSO clients indicated that the average number of evaluations they had commissioned from suppliers in the last three years (including the current financial year) was six evaluations. Findings from a survey of 63% of the clients indicate that they intend to commission five evaluations on average per annum over the next three financial years.

3.1.2 *Benin*

The interviews and questionnaires indicated that the most significant and most constant demand for evaluation services in Benin comes from technical and financing partners (donors). The study found that approximately 90% of the demand for evaluation came from donors, 10% from government, and 0% from NGOs. The study also found that donors have better management systems and processes for evaluations than government (e.g. terms of reference, awarding of contracts and general administration of the tender process).

The Benin government conducted five evaluations in 2010 and seven in 2012. Since then, the demand has slowed down. The diagnostic found evidence of increasing demand for evaluations from donors in Benin.

3.1.3 *South Africa*

The research indicated that non-government demand in South Africa is strong and growing. This is dominated by local "not-for-profits" and international private foundations rather than donor countries.

As mentioned earlier, sufficient data is available to make rough estimates of current and future government demand in South Africa. Information is also available on whether supply has historically been able to meet government demand.

At the time of the diagnostic study, there were approximately 570 evaluations in total in the DPME national evaluation plans (NEP), provincial evaluation plans (PEP) and departmental evaluation plans (DEPs) which have been compiled by DPME. (The NEP and PEP contain evaluations which are coordinated by DPME and the Offices of the Premier with departmental participation, whereas the DEPs contain evaluations which are largely managed by departments on their own.)



The different plans span different periods but collectively they cover the period from 2012/13 to 2019/2020. Some of the evaluations in the plans have been cancelled or never started, and some are not funded.

The NEP 17/18 – 19/20 indicates that 17 NEP evaluations were underway in September 2016. This is approximately 21% of the 81 evaluations identified in the national evaluation plans 2012/13 to 2019/20. (Some had been completed, some were still in preparation stage, some were still to be implemented in the future, and some had stalled or been dropped). The average number of evaluations underway is a key indicator because it is the number of evaluations which will draw capacity from the supply market at any one time.

Applying a similar percentage to the 77 evaluations in the PEPs plans would yield an estimate of 16 provincial evaluations underway in September 2016. Thus, between the NEP and PEPs, it can be estimated that approximately 33 evaluations were underway in September 2016.

Information is only available on a few departmental evaluations prior to the 2016/17 financial year (for example, in an undated report, the Western Cape Department of Agriculture refers to five completed evaluations and seven further evaluations under way). According to interviews with DPME staff, there were relatively few departmental evaluations prior to 2016, and the Western Cape Department of Agriculture would have been an exception. The figure of 33 mentioned above should therefore be increased by a factor to take account of departmental evaluations. One could therefore make a rough estimate that there were approximately 40 government evaluations underway in September 2016.

There has recently been a marked increase in the number of evaluations in DEPs (with a total of 398 evaluations now listed in the DPME DEP database (including both national and provincial departments). Interviews with staff in DPME indicate that this is related to the introduction of a Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT) standard for evaluation in 2015 and 2016 (DPME, undated), which included a requirement to produce departmental evaluation plans.

Most of the evaluations in the DEP database do not have figures in the budget column. Some of them indicate that they took place in previous financial years, but the type of evaluation is “still to be confirmed”. In addition, the dates of the evaluations are captured in the database by the date of the plan, e.g. for some of them the date is ‘2015-2020’. It is therefore not possible to use the database to determine which of the evaluations have been completed and which of them will be carried out in future. In addition, DPME is not receiving progress reports against the DEPs, so the progress of all the evaluations in the DEP database is unknown.

It is likely that many departments still have challenges in terms of their organisational capacity for evaluation and in terms of creating an enabling environment for evaluation, despite having



produced DEPs. There is a possibility that some of the DEPs may have been produced as a compliance response to the MPAT standard, rather than as a genuine attempt to carry out evaluations.

Some of the departments are unlikely to have the capacity to effectively prepare, commission and manage evaluations and most of the DEP evaluations will be done without the involvement and support of DPME and the Offices of the Premier. The implementation rate of evaluations in the DEPs is therefore likely to be lower than that of the NEP and PEPs. Furthermore, some of the programmes identified for evaluation in the DEPs may not be evaluable – some of them may not have clear objectives or theories of change to evaluate against and there may not be any useful monitoring data available to inform the evaluations. However, a respondent in DPME indicated that theories of change can be ‘retrofitted’ to programmes and that some useful evaluation work can be done even if there is very little monitoring data.

DPME staff indicate that they have put appropriate courses in place to develop demand-side skills in government for planning, commissioning and managing evaluations and for using the results. They indicate that DPME used to run such courses in-house but have since requested the School of Government to offer the courses. However, the School of Government is demand-driven, and some departments may not be aware of the need to develop their demand-side evaluation management capacity. DPME is therefore considering offering the courses in-house again. This should be a priority in the light of the increase in the number of departments planning to carry out evaluations.

In the light of the above, two DEP implementation scenarios may be considered – one with an implementation rate equal to that of the NEP (the ‘high’ scenario), and one with an implementation rate half that of the NEP (the ‘low’ scenario).

The ‘high’ scenario would therefore assume that 20% (similarly to the NEP) of the evaluations in the DEP database would be underway at any one time. This would mean that 80 DEP evaluations could be underway at any one time during 2019/2020. The ‘low’ scenario, (with 10% underway at any one time), results in 40 DEP evaluations being underway at any one time by 2019/2020.

If demand from the NEP¹ and PEPs remains roughly constant, it could thus be estimated that the total government demand for evaluations could increase from approximately 40 being underway at any one time in 2016 to between 80 and 120 in 2019/20. In other words, it appears that the marked increase in the number of evaluations in DEPs could result in a doubling or tripling of government demand for evaluations over the next three years. In addition, there is a possibility

¹ The DPME budget for evaluations remains roughly constant over the next three years, at between R12 m and R14 m per annum.



that municipalities, particularly the metros, might start carrying out more evaluations in future, which would further add to government demand.

DPME indicates that the average cost of its evaluations is R2 million (US\$0.15m). Based on the above assumptions, and assuming an average duration of a year for an evaluation (including preparation and procurement), the government evaluation market could therefore increase in value from approximately R80 million (US\$6m) per annum currently to between R180 and R240 million (between US\$14m and US\$24m) per annum within three years. This is not prohibitively large in the context of South Africa's economy and the size of its research and management consulting industries.

Regarding donor demand in South Africa, four of the major donors operating in South Africa were interviewed (DIFID, USAID, the EU and GIZ). All four donors indicated that they do not usually contract directly in South Africa for individual evaluations. Three of the donors indicated that tenders are issued for period framework contracts in their home countries or internationally and then orders are placed against these framework contracts when an evaluation is required. The companies or consortia on the framework contracts often sub-contract local expertise for evaluations to enable them to understand the local environment.

One of the government interviewees argued that government should reconsider its approach of outsourcing evaluations. The respondent suggested that mid-term reviews and government strategic planning processes could be used to develop an evaluative culture. The respondent argued that government needs to find a balance between the goal of independent evaluation and the goal of developing an evaluation culture within government. This point is also made in the report of the evaluation of the National Evaluation System (Genesis, 2017:127): *“Respondents noted that in the absence of senior-level buy-in, or a reluctance around evaluation, conducting internal evaluations to demonstrate the worth of evaluations, and the process of evaluations, is helpful. For example, in the DST, an M&E staff member conducted an internal evaluation to show the benefits of evaluation. This respondent noted that in doing so, they were able to garner senior level buy-in.... A broad range of respondents highlighted the need to promote evaluative thinking in departments and provinces. Respondents from the Eastern Cape, for example, noted that in a resource constrained environment where large scale evaluations are not always possible, departments should be focusing on also looking at other tools for cheaper processes than full evaluations. This could include processes to promote evaluative thinking, reflecting on learnings from their programmes, and on communicating these learnings to other provinces and departments”*.



3.2 Characteristics of country supply

3.2.1 *Size and nature of country supply*

Uganda

There is no single information system on evaluator availability and opportunities in Uganda. The only source of information about available evaluators is the Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA) and the USAID funded Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services (MEMS) project that developed a roster of Ugandan institutions, firms and individual consultants for monitoring and evaluation services. However, UEA and MEMS are currently inactive because of limited funding. There is also no available data about evaluators who have recently conducted evaluations in Uganda. Findings from the survey of clients show that most of them (71%) have their own databases of evaluation providers.

There is a growing number of individual consultants and consultancy organizations that have been undertaking evaluations or related work on projects, programmes and policies in Uganda. The MEMS project developed a roster of Ugandan institutions, firms and individual consultants for monitoring and evaluation services, in 2006. The roster identified 18 Ugandan-based firms, 11 institutions and 75 individuals that provide M&E services. These have either served their respective clients satisfactorily or been assessed as having the required experience, qualifications, and credibility, as in quality of product produced. The roster was updated in 2012. The updated roster has 158 Ugandan experts in evaluation.

The universities are endowed with highly qualified teaching and research staff, which presents good opportunities to conduct evaluations. Potential exists to build the capacities of these institutions to bridge any evaluation supply-demand gaps.

The Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC) is an economic policy research centre that undertakes policy analysis, evidence-based advocacy and advice to the Ugandan government to enable her to formulate and implement good policies and strengthen public institutions towards accelerated development. The relative strength of EPRC appears to relate to its ability to work legitimately within the political economy and therefore provides an entry point for evaluation capacity development. EPRC is fully funded by the government and therefore has potential for shifting the latent demand to actual demand and developing evaluation capacity.

The Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA) was formed in May 2001 and registered in 2002 as a professional association and national chapter of the African Evaluation Association. The main objective was to create a national network to facilitate sharing of methods, procedures and practical evaluation frameworks among evaluators who were operating in isolation, build capacity for evaluation and promote professionalism in evaluation practice. The Association started with a



membership of over fifty individuals drawn from monitoring and evaluation units in Government, parastatals, local and international NGOs, private organizations and members of the public that are engaged in evaluation practice. The UEA is supported by USAID and the World Bank.

The survey of clients who commission evaluations indicates that most of the clients contract suppliers using the RFQ approach (57%), while 29% of clients use mixed approaches (open tender and RFQ), and the rest use an open tender approach. The survey indicates that clients receive between 3- 10 responses per RFQ or tender. Findings from the survey also show that in all cases they receive responses from evaluators. There are differences in responsiveness depending on the type of evaluation, varying with the technicality of the projects, level of measurements that may be required, scope and size of the evaluation.

The survey had contradictory findings regarding whether supply is sufficient to meet demand. The survey of clients indicated that the supply of evaluators is not sufficient to meet the demand. However, the survey of individual evaluators indicated that they are under-utilised – most of the evaluators (71%) ranked their estimated capacity at 50% more than they were undertaking.

South Africa

South Africa also has a substantial pool of practising and potential evaluators. However, the South African diagnostic study pointed to several difficulties in accurately measuring the size of this pool. It argued that measuring the size of the current country supply of evaluation consultants is like answering the question: 'How long is a piece of string?' The answer is: "It depends....". This is because:

- a) There is no clear definition of what an "evaluation consultant" is. There is a debate in South Africa as to whether evaluation specialists, or sector specialists with some evaluation training, or both are required to carry out evaluations. Some evaluation consultants are self-taught in evaluation. The size of the potential supply market will vary depending on how an "evaluation consultant" is defined.
- b) Many consultants who carry out evaluations also do other research and consulting work. Some do evaluations frequently, others only occasionally. Some of those doing evaluations occasionally might do more evaluations under certain circumstances, others might not.
- c) Many evaluation consultancies do not employ permanent evaluation staff – rather, they form evaluation-specific associations with individuals with the required qualifications, expertise and experience. There is therefore a pool of people, some evaluation specialists, some sector specialists, who can be drawn on by evaluation consultancies. Many of these people work for a range of different evaluation consultancies. Many of them also have



other non-evaluation work. The size of this pool depends partly on the eligibility requirements for the evaluations.

- d) The quantity of potential supply also depends on the sector in which the evaluation is carried out. Some sectors have more researchers and specialist consultants than others, and evaluation is more established in some sectors than others.
- e) Some suppliers or potential suppliers can choose whether to do evaluations for certain clients or not, as they have other options for earning an income. Their availability to carry out evaluations often depends on factors such as who the client is, the track-record of the client in terms of the way in which it manages evaluations, the quality of the terms of reference and whether the budget is realistic.

The South African diagnostic concluded that it was thus not possible to quantitatively measure the size of the current country supply.

Of the 15 individual evaluators who completed the online survey, all but one indicated that they have capacity to undertake more evaluations. This is an interesting finding as it appears to counter the view that there is a shortage of supply relative to demand in South Africa. However, it could be due to those suppliers needing more work being more likely to complete the survey.

Only 2 of the 13 supplier consultancy respondents to the online survey indicated that they do not have capacity to take on more work. Most indicated that they have capacity to take on between 30% and 50% more work per annum. This could be an indication that there is not yet a general shortage of supply, but because the sample of respondents is small, and the total population is unknown, it is not possible to be conclusive in this regard.

Nine of the consultancies indicated that they are planning to take on more capacity over the next three years if demand increases. However, ten of the consultancies indicated that they experience difficulties with recruiting competent people capable of leading or managing an evaluation. Several respondents indicated that they subcontract freelancers rather than hire staff. Some indicated that there are very few competent evaluators looking for employment. One indicated that they prefer to hire emerging evaluators or senior sectoral specialists and train them in evaluation. There was also an indication that it is difficult to find people who can write very well and who can carefully analyse qualitative data.

While supply has been meeting government demand to date, it may not be able to meet a government demand which becomes two or three times larger within the next three years. Although supply has met demand to date, there are indications that supply may be over-concentrated. DPME staff have found that the number of strong evaluators who regularly respond to RFPs from amongst the pool of evaluators on their panel is relatively small (Podems, Goldman



and Jacob, in Canadian Evaluation Society, 2014). However, as will be discussed later in this report, there are other possible reasons why relatively few suppliers are responding to DPME RFPs.

One of the officials from one of the Offices of the Premier indicated that there have been a few occasions in some of the provinces when bids have had to be re-issued due to a lack of responses which meet the requirements. However, the bids were eventually awarded. It was indicated that the education and health sectors do not have a supply problem due to a history of evaluation in those sectors.

Three of the twelve client respondents to the online survey indicated that bidders have difficulty meeting the required minimum qualification or experience levels. One respondent indicated that *“It is difficult to find a bidder who has the right mix of evaluation and programme content area experience and expertise. Very often, bidders ignore the requirement to have a team that comprises a mixture of well-known experts in both areas.”* Another indicated that there is a sometimes a lack of *“contextual knowledge and understanding of the sector”*. Another indicated that *“most service providers would have experience in research, but not in evaluation.”*

Three of the twelve client respondents to the online survey also indicated that they had had RFQ's or tenders for which no responses which meet the minimum requirements were received. This is an indication that there is a relatively small problem of non-responsiveness to some RFQ's or tenders. However, as indicated elsewhere in this report, this is not necessarily an indication of a shortage of supply. It could also be an indication of weaknesses with the RFQ's or potential bidders choosing not to work for a client.

Senior officials managing evaluations in government indicated that they often have problems with the quality of work carried out by the appointed evaluators. They indicated that this often results in them having to “co-produce” the evaluations (something viewed by the officials as negative).

A view was put across that some service providers do not like to do evaluations for some government departments because those departments are too strict and therefore not a source of easy money for the service providers.

Five of the twelve client respondents to the online survey indicated that they had experienced problems with the quality of evaluations provided by suppliers. Details of these problems included:

- a) *“Many service providers are unable to develop good logic models and theories of change*
- b) *Some bidders do not know the value of developing evaluation frameworks and of identifying indicators*
- c) *Logic, flow, language and grammar of the reports*
- d) *Poor quality judgements*



- e) *(Poor quality) literature reviews*
- f) *Evaluators are afraid to be critical because they feel that if they are too critical, they may not be awarded tenders in the future*
- g) *Evaluation team members are often inexperienced*
- h) *The service providers do not provide proper analysis when it comes to findings of the evaluation. Most of the time they would just provide sweeping statements which are not supported by any evidence.*
- i) *They struggle with producing good literature reviews, report structure, use of theories of change to make a narrative."*

These responses are interesting because they highlight the differences in views of the sources of quality problems between the suppliers and clients. It indicates that there are quality problems on the supply side as well as on the demand side.

In response to the question: *Are there any particular aspects of evaluations that your evaluation suppliers have commonly had problems with?*, one of the respondents gave the following response, suggesting a different approach to the procurement of evaluations: *"Our own requirements for proposals may be too unfair. We should not expect them to spend a high amount of time on something for which they are not guaranteed a return. We need to rethink our approach. Perhaps simply ask for expressions of interest (with details of the evaluation team) and use the CVs of team members and their levels of effort and examples of their past work to select the service provider. Once selected, then the service provider could prepare a proposal."*

Suggestions for improvements to the quality of work done by suppliers included:

- a) *"DPME needs to develop standards and criteria for evaluation, that are widely known*
- b) *Distribute some good example of theories of change and logical frameworks to all stakeholders*
- c) *The more established evaluation suppliers could be paired with emerging ones to increase capacity*
- d) *Get them to apply themselves more"*.

It is interesting that none of the client respondents suggested improvements to the quality of demand to improve the quality of supply. This is again an indication of the gulf in understanding between clients and suppliers regarding the causes of quality problems. In addition, five of the twelve client respondents were of the view that supply is inadequate to meet demand, which is generally different to the view of suppliers.

An official in DPME indicated that supply is inadequate in relation to demand because many of the submitted evaluations must be reworked by DPME officials. However, in 2013 DPME carried



out a quality assessment of 135 evaluations in its repository of government evaluations and ranked them. It found that the quality of 85% of the evaluations was adequate or better than adequate (Goldman et al, 2013).

Poor quality of service is a common problem in South Africa, which is not unique to evaluation service providers. In addition, competency requirements and professionalisation may not necessarily guarantee quality of service. For example, managers of infrastructure departments in government also complain about the poor quality of service which is sometimes provided by professionally registered engineers.

As will be discussed later in this report, there are several possible causes of quality problems on evaluations and it is wrong to jump to the conclusion that the existence of quality problems on some evaluations is an indication of inadequate supply.

All the donors who were interviewed indicated that they sometimes have quality problems with the evaluations carried out by international companies or consortia. This is interesting, because it indicates that quality problems with evaluations are not unique to South Africa, and because it supports the point that the existence of quality problems is not necessarily an indication of a shortage of supply. (There are a range of other possible causes of quality problems, including weaknesses in procurement process and weaknesses in the management of the service providers.) One of the donors indicated that they would attribute the cause of quality problems to weaknesses with their own procurement or evaluation management processes.

It is also interesting that the donors are issuing framework contracts for evaluations. As will be discussed later in this report, it is recommended that DPME should work with the Chief Procurement Office in National Treasury to develop an evaluation procurement strategy. If this recommendation is accepted, then the donors could be requested to assist with procurement advice based on their experience of taking a more efficient and strategic approach to evaluation procurement. One of the donors indicated that they had been through processes of strategic 'commercial' reviews which had resulted in better procurement of evaluations.

Notwithstanding the quality of service issue, historically, the supply market in South Africa has met the government demand for evaluation. Officials in DPME indicate that they have not had to cancel any requests for proposals (RFPs) due to a lack of response from the market (although occasionally RFPs have had to be re-issued because the quality of the responses was poor). There is only one reference in one of the PEPs (Mpumalanga) to a cancellation of an RFP due to no responses being received.

Benin



From consultants who answered the questionnaires, only 11% of these consultants reported working in formal offices for most of the time. According to the consultants interviewed, there seems to be a preference to conduct evaluations in personal spaces to avoid the recurrent costs inherent in the management of an office. At times when a project demands a multiple skill set, they would sooner prefer to team up on an ad hoc basis and then resume their private practice afterwards. This assists in managing the costs associated with the supply of consulting services.

Other aspects raised during the interviews included the preference by consultants towards working independently. Some consultants indicated that they would prefer to recruit additional skills and build their teams for specific evaluations as opposed to working with consulting firms. In instances where a consulting firm is required for an evaluation, consultants confirmed that they would sooner take the work to an existing smaller consulting firm and pay a once off institutional cost than to create their own company. The country's national tax policy and the administrative bureaucracy in the field of evaluation have been noted as discouraging factors for the creation of companies in evaluation.

It became clear that consultants prefer to work in a private capacity to manage costs. These factors have resulted in the commitment to the supply of evaluation services on an ad hoc basis. This was confirmed in the research through the realisation that most Heads of Mission were involved in other vocational training such as teachers, researchers, physicians, engineers, etc. They would only get involved in the provision of evaluation services on a needs basis.

3.2.2 Skills, training, and education

Uganda

Non-state capacity for evaluation exists in civil society organizations, in research and training institutions and with consultants and consulting firms. Such technically good evaluation actors offer entry points to evaluation capacity development efforts. However, the development of that capacity is not supported systematically by the state or by donors. Nevertheless, some development partners have collaborated with research institutions and universities on in-country evaluation capacity development initiatives. A case in point is the partnership between GIZ and UTAMI to start the first ever Master of Arts programme in Evaluation Uganda.

The general view of persons in GoU, donor representatives as well as people in the consulting environment is that Ugandan M&E capacity is still generally weak. Regarding capacity for evaluation in the CSOs, the study observed that generally M&E staffs in CSOs have only taken a 3-week course in M&E, and local consultants offering evaluation services are not necessarily better trained or more experienced.



The survey of individual evaluators indicated that 50% of the evaluators have not completed any specific courses in M&E (i.e. they are self-taught). Survey results showed that individual evaluators had either completed a short course in evaluation or completed an M&E module as part of a degree. Capacity development in most CSOs is ad hoc. The survey of individual evaluators indicated that most evaluators (43%) have experience in carrying out evaluations of between 1 and 3 years, implying that evaluators in Uganda have limited experience.

3ie and the Government of Uganda facilitated logistics for an impact evaluation technical training course provided by the Centre for Learning and Results (CLEAR) in Uganda in 2013. The course was attended by staff from various Government agencies as well as policymakers and researchers from other countries in sub-Saharan Africa. 3ie has provided bursaries for OPM representatives to attend several courses and conferences related to impact evaluation and rigorous evidence including for the seventh international AfrEA meeting in 2014 and the Campbell Collaboration Colloquium in 2013. GIZ/GoU provided capacity building for the public sector, civil society, private sector in evaluation contributing to a pool of evaluators in 2012 to 2015.

The MEMS project also conducted a series of training sessions in performance management to 302 people that have contributed immensely to the capacity of Ugandan evaluation staff to conduct their M&E activities more effectively.

There are several opportunities for local evaluation capacity building in Uganda and in other communities of practice such as CSOs in the form of training programs in monitoring and evaluation at the universities and training institutes. Currently, the most well developed (and popular) training courses in M&E are provided by the Uganda Management Institute (UMI), UTAMI and the Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR), but M&E is in most cases part of Project Planning & Management course curricula at Ugandan universities across the country. In addition, there are donor-supported training events in Uganda as well as regional and international resources for evaluation capacity building.

UMI offers a two-week course and post graduate diploma on project monitoring and evaluation. In developing the curriculum for the postgraduate programme, UMI consulted a few government agencies, donors and CSOs, which emphasized that the course should be relevant to the M&E needs within government, be based on programme theory rather than project thinking, and address M&E in thematic areas such as humanitarian assistance.

MISR is usually contracted by the OPM to conduct M&E training for members of the National M&E Technical Working Group. The training module is an adaptation of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) training curriculum. M&E capacity development initiatives that have taken place were not always adequately coordinated (BTC Uganda, 2012), and furthermore were concentrated mainly at central line ministry level, largely foregoing



investment in M&E (and more broadly education management) capacity at district level. In fact, district level M&E is often considered to function merely as an outpost for central-level data collection and does not necessarily address local level implementation realities.

As part of the initiative to build local M&E capacity, USAID provides financial support to its local implementing partners (these include local governments) to attend training courses on M&E. The USAID supported the MEMS project to offer training in evaluation to USAID partner organizations (Save the Children, Africare, TASO, AIC, IRC, CRD, and others). In the second phase of MEMS, USAID requested MEMS to focus on training for improved monitoring and reporting of results. The Ugandan Evaluation Association (UEA) has existed since 2002 and has the potential to provide ongoing professional networking and development if provided with support. The association can be a forum where evaluation professionals meet and share information and good practices on evaluation in addition to organizing short courses on topics of interest to its members. Once it is nurtured the UEA has the potential to contribute to professionalizing home-grown evaluation capacity.

At the regional level, the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA) is an association of M&E associations and networks in Africa. Their website contains information on both regional and international graduate degrees and diplomas, short courses and workshops on evaluation. AfrEA conferences, usually preceded by professional development workshops, are another forum for capacity building. The conferences are also an opportunity for sharing knowledge and experience on evaluation, from which good practices and lessons can be identified, just as networks can be built. The AfrEA website also contains resource materials on M&E that can be used to professionalize evaluation, i.e. guidelines, standards and methodologies on evaluation, web links to evaluation journals, and links to other useful websites.

At the international level, the IPDET evaluation training programme in Canada targets officers occupying senior and middle level evaluation, audit and management positions in developed and developing economies and who work in government, NGOs and the private sector. Between 2001-2007, about 25 CSO representatives from Uganda took the IPDET2 course.

Associations such as the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE), the European Evaluation Society (EES), and the International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) also provide opportunities for the strengthening of institutions' and individuals' evaluation capacity, through conferences where the sharing of knowledge on evaluation theory and practices around the world is facilitated. Their websites contain extensive electronic resources as well as information on training programs that offer certificate or graduate qualifications in evaluation.

²International Program for Development Evaluation Training – www.ipdet.org



Survey findings showed that most clients had sent, or are planning to send, their staff involved in managing evaluations on training courses. The training courses include: certificate /diploma in monitoring and evaluation, project planning and management, basic research skills, research designs frameworks and quality control.

Benin

The feedback from the questionnaires indicated that two thirds (24/37) of evaluation consultants hold a Master's degree, and 3 hold PhD's. It was found that skills were focused in the sectors that the consultants have proven competencies in.

The responses from the questionnaires illustrate that of the 37 people interviewed, 31 of them had reinforced their evaluation skills through a form of educational upskilling. It was found that no consultant had undergone any initial training in evaluation. However, almost all have experienced modules or subjects related to evaluation. The consultants gradually invest in themselves through short courses and online modules on evaluation.

Many structures offer capacity building in evaluation. In response to the interviews and questionnaires conducted in this research, the training ranged from university training institutions and other organisations such as that of the UN.

Regarding training institutions at the national level, only two institutions offer courses that specialise in evaluation: The African School of Economics (ASE) and The National School of Administration and Judiciary (ENAM), with the latter scheduling to offer a Master's degree in Public Policy Evaluation from 2017/2018. The ESA offers a certificate in impact assessment and provides training on data collection to consultants for impact evaluations as well as impact assessment for specialists.

In interviews with academic training institutions, it became evident that most applicants for continuing education in evaluation came from fields such as economics and finance, agriculture, health and transport. This was possible through the support of bilateral and multilateral organisations. In less frequent cases, consultants enrolled in continuing education on their own.

Both government and donors confirmed that they are generally satisfied with the level of competence/skills by consultants at a local level. However, it also found there is a shortage of certain skills locally, such as educational statisticians and economic and financial analysts. This shortage of skills meant that there was a need to seek internationally for foreign consultants that could meet the skills gap.

South Africa



Documentation (e.g. SAMEA, 2015) and an internet search indicates that there has been a rapid increase in the number of M&E courses provided by public and private tertiary education and training institutions in South Africa. This appears to have been a supply-side response to the increasing focus on M&E by government since 1994 as well as the general increase in interest in M&E internationally.

Short courses on M&E and M&E modules in under-graduate courses are now being offered by most universities in South Africa, including the University of Johannesburg, the University of the Witwatersrand, the University of Stellenbosch, the University of Cape Town (UCT), the University of KwaZulu-Natal, UNISA, the University of Pretoria, and the University of Fort Hare. Such courses are also offered by a range of private colleges and non-governmental organisations.

Wits and Stellenbosch also offer post-graduate diplomas in M&E, and Wits, Stellenbosch and UCT also offer Master's programmes in M&E. However, to date only one university (UCT) is offering a Master's degree in Evaluation (as opposed to M&E).

A university respondent indicated that demand for post-graduate training in evaluation is very high, and far exceeds the places available. General university funding issues are constraining the ability of the university to increase the supply of training to meet the demand – even though more income could be obtained by increasing enrolments, fees are capped, and it is difficult to obtain approval for new posts. The respondent indicated that efforts are therefore under way to raise funds from outside government to enable an increase in enrolments in post-graduate evaluation courses.

Several respondents indicated that a lag between demand and supply should be expected, because it takes time for capacity to be built to catch up with an increase in demand.

Most of the suppliers interviewed indicated that their preference is to employ evaluators with sector expertise and experience who have learned evaluation methods, as opposed to employing evaluators who have specialised in evaluation but have limited sector expertise or experience. Most of the suppliers interviewed indicated that they send their evaluation staff on evaluation courses and have some form of induction or development programme for their evaluators, including elements such as training on evaluation theory, skills training, training on data analysis and mentoring. One of the suppliers indicated that they need people who can think through problems and solve them – in addition to having knowledge of evaluation.

One supplier indicated that there are not enough training programmes for evaluators. She identified a need for a thorough assessment of the skills gaps (as opposed to generalisations about a lack of capacity), the results of which should be fed into the training sector.



The thirteen supplier organisation respondents to the online survey indicated that their employees capable of leading or managing an evaluation have a mix of evaluation qualifications, including 'self-taught', a short course, a module in an undergraduate degree, or a post-graduate degree in M&E. Most of the respondents indicated that they have staff with between 3 and 10 years of experience of carrying out evaluations who they view as being capable of leading or managing an evaluation. Some respondents even indicated that they have staff with between 1 and 3 years of carrying out evaluations who they view as being capable of leading or managing an evaluation.

Of the 15 individual evaluators who completed the online survey, only three have a post-graduate qualification in M&E. 6 have done a module as part of an undergraduate degree, and the remainder are either self-taught (3) or have done short courses (4). Approximately 50% specialise in sectors. Only 1 had experience of undertaking evaluations of less than 5 years, most had between 5 and 10 years of experience, and 4 had more than 10 years of experience.

Ten of the thirteen supplier organisation respondents to the online survey indicated that they train their evaluation staff in one way or another, including through internships; sending staff on short courses; internal training; online courses; internal study groups; funded training programmes; bursaries; sending staff to conferences, workshops and seminars; and listening to webinars.

3.2.2 Minimum competency requirements and professionalisation

Uganda

The UEA developed and endorsed in 2013 for the first time the Uganda Evaluation Standards that provide guidance on how evaluation professionals and users should behave, what concepts and practices evaluators should use, the benchmarks their products should meet, and the outcomes they should achieve. The standards are in conformity with the African Evaluation Association (Afrea) Guidelines and the good practices endorsed by the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE).

The Government has developed guidelines for public sector evaluations and the UEA has developed and approved standard guidelines that stipulate that evaluators and evaluation teams must be independent, trustworthy and transparently selected. They must have appropriate knowledge, skills mix, and proven competencies in evaluation methodology and specialist area(s). The evaluators should have professional work experience relevant to the evaluation. The evaluation team should be gender sensitive, where applicable. This diagnostic study did not find examples of written guidelines on how to conduct, commission or manage evaluations; rather ToRs are developed on a case-by-case basis, usually in collaboration with a donor.

The professional skills required from evaluators by both government and CSOs include among others; experts at PhD level but also at Masters level with a wealth of experience in research are



considered for the lead investigator, extent to which the evaluator has been able to publish their work, relationship with academia, evidence of similar work done before and list of contacts, experience in using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies, participated as the lead in at least three assessments/evaluations, demonstrate deep knowledge of the field to be evaluated, experience in designing and managing evaluations, diversity and complementarity of the team. Survey results show that the minimum qualifications or experience vary per evaluation. The experience required is at least 6 years' experience with M&E, and impact evaluation in working in the specific sector in developing countries. The core skills required usually include computational and analytical skills, business analysis skills, computer skills relevant to data management, database design, statistical analysis skills, training skills, good communication and interpersonal skills, report writing and drafting skills. Other qualities and attributes required include: integrity, empathy, confidentiality and innovativeness.

Survey results also indicated that most evaluators (75%) do not have difficulty in meeting the minimum qualifications or experience levels.

Benin

Most organisations seeking suppliers of evaluations services require a minimum requirement of a Master's degree, in some cases a PhD or doctorate is required. In a limited number of cases, it was found that the local supply of evaluators did not meet the requirements and supply was then sought and fulfilled through international consultants.

The number of years of experience required for Chief or Heads of Mission varied between 10 and 15 years. Consistently, seekers and consultants both agreed that this criterion has mostly fulfilled. The seekers of evaluators confirmed that the number of years of experience of evaluation suppliers averaged at a minimum of 20 years of experience. Only one out of 37 evaluators had experience below ten years. The majority (29/37- almost 80% of the consultants) had between 10 and 20 years of experience in evaluation. The remaining 20% consisted of consultants with over 21 years of experience.

South Africa

The question of whether the existing education and training capacity is adequate for producing the evaluation capacity required in South Africa is dependent on the definition of minimum competency requirements for evaluation. Does a competent evaluator need to have a Master's degree in evaluation? Or is a masters or diploma in M&E sufficient? Or is a short-course or a module in an under-graduate degree sufficient? Or can evaluations of adequate quality be carried out by good researchers with any post-graduate degree, who are self-taught in evaluation



methods? Is knowledge of the sector being evaluated not as important, or more important, than generic knowledge of evaluation methods?

These are some of the questions that the evaluation community in South Africa has been engaging with as part of the debate over minimum competency requirements and professionalisation (Podems, undated; SAMEA, 2014; SAMEA and DPME, 2015). The debate over minimum competency requirements and professionalisation is an international debate:

“To have competencies or not to have competencies? That now seems to be a question for program evaluators and evaluation associations from around the globe.... Although program evaluation is a growing practice that has become a recognized field of vocation and study, wide interpretations of what competencies are necessary to guide evaluation practice remain. Commentators have provided many arguments, both positive and negative, surrounding the development, implementation, and potential use of competencies.... Some fear that it might provide a stranglehold on what evaluators can do; that it could not cover the variety of competencies needed for different evaluations; and that it might provide commissioners and managers of an evaluation with an inflexible list of competencies that would hold evaluators to account in unhelpful ways....Clearly, the evaluation community has not fully reached consensus on a set of evaluator competencies that would represent the diverse philosophical and practical approaches currently used in program evaluation.” (King and Podems in Canadian Evaluation Society, 2014)

As described by Podems, Goldman and Jacob (in Canadian Evaluation Society, 2014), although evaluation has not yet been professionalised in South Africa, the competencies required for government evaluation have been defined through the Evaluation Competency Framework for Government (DPME, 2014). This framework describes the competencies (knowledge, skills, and abilities) in relation to four dimensions: (a) overarching considerations, (b) leadership, (c) evaluation craft, and (d) the implementation of evaluations. Each dimension is then divided into descriptive areas. These competencies are generally being used across government to inform competency requirements in ToRs for government evaluations. Nine of the twelve client respondents to the online survey indicated that they are using the DPME Standards for Evaluation in Government as a guide for how to manage evaluations, as well as the DPME Evaluation Competency Framework for Government as the basis for setting the minimum competency requirements for bidders.

3.2.4 Representivity of supply

Uganda



There is limited information on the shape of the current pool of skills in terms of age, gender, language, organization or individuals. Findings from the survey of individual evaluators showed that 67 % of the evaluators were men, implying that evaluations in Uganda are dominated by men. What is also known is that with a few exceptions evaluation teams are led by foreign consultants from the western countries although there is, in most cases, participation and support to varying degrees of national evaluators. Most of the evaluations identified by the study from 2005 to 2016 have been initiated, commissioned and managed by donors; with USAID accounting for about half of these (the study used web-based searches).

Benin

On the supply side, it became evident that this was almost exclusively male dominated. Out of the 43 evaluations conducted (24 by government and 19 by donors) only one head of mission was female. Out of 19 donor evaluations conducted, only one female head of mission was identified. Out of a total of 37 responses to the consultants' questionnaires in the study only 3, less than 10 percent, came from women as opposed to the 34 from men.

The Swiss Cooperation in one of its programs has endeavored to sponsor the studies of female candidates in research and or professional Master's degrees in evaluation to strengthen their presence in this highly male dominated profession. Even at this level, it was noted that applications for these programs were limited in both numbers and quality of candidates.

The researchers of this research on evaluation only met up with two female evaluation consultants. In their opinion, the stresses, pressures of delivery times and very irregular working hours places an additional burden on family obligations, and thus fewer women get involved in the supply chain of evaluation services.

South Africa

As with other sectors of the South African economy, there is a need to increase the representivity of evaluators to address the inequalities created by apartheid. Three out of 10 firms that have been awarded more than one evaluation from the DPME panel are level 1 BBBEE contributors, and 5 of the 10 are level 4 contributors.

Of the 15 individual evaluators who completed the online survey, nine were black and 11 were female. Five of the thirteen supplier organisations respondents to the online survey indicated that their evaluation staff are 50% or more black, and a further two indicated that their staff are 40% or more black. Nine of the 13 indicated that their evaluation staff are 50% or more female, and a further two indicated that their evaluation staff are 40% female.



Established suppliers expressed interest in partnering with, or subcontracting to emerging black-owned firms, but indicated that a mechanism to introduce established suppliers to emerging suppliers would be helpful.

Several of the supplier organisation respondents to the online survey indicated that there is a shortage of black evaluators. One respondent indicated: *“But where are they supposed to come from? Government offers good salaries and job security, academia offers development potential and job security, so the good black people choose that over the uncertainty of consulting.”*

A respondent from an emerging black-owned evaluation consultancy indicated that they experience all the same challenges with government evaluations that are raised by more established suppliers (these are discussed in another section below). However, these challenges have more impact on emerging firms than they do on established firms. For example, delays in approving deliverables leading to delays in payment have more impact on emerging firms because emerging firms don't have the cash-flow to deal with such delays. In addition, emerging firms don't yet have the established networks of associates that more established firms have, and it is harder for them to retain evaluation teams during long delays between submitting bids and the award of tenders. The respondent indicated that it is particularly difficult for them to obtain commitments to partner for bids from people with evaluation expertise as they usually indicate that they are very busy. He indicated that his firm's barriers to growth are technical in nature – their main challenge is to build up a core team with the required expertise. Continuity of evaluation work would help in terms of building up such a core team.

A university respondent indicated that most of the post-graduate evaluation students are black, implying that the representivity of the supply market in terms of people carrying out evaluations is likely to improve over time.

3.2.5 Pricing

Uganda

The pricing of skills varies according to experience and education. The pricing also depends on whether an evaluator is local or international with the latter commanding high pay because of the extra costs such as accommodation and airfare. Results from the survey of local individual evaluators show that the average charge-out rate per day was US\$200 and ranged from US\$50-US\$300.

Benin

It was found that tariffs range as follows (in \$US):

1 – 11% of the consultants ranged between: 90 – 180



2 – 30 % of the consultants ranged between: 180 - 270

3 – 35% of the consultants ranged between: 270 - 360

4 – 24% of consultants charged higher than 360.

The pricing spectrum is broad for the various consultants due to their different skills and diverse demand levels.

South Africa

For the 15 individual evaluators who completed the online survey, the indicated charge-out rates per day varied between US\$180 and US\$715. Four were between 180 and 285 and seven were 430 and above. For the supplier organisations (including companies), daily charge out rates for evaluators provided by the respondents varied widely, from US\$180 per day for one small firm to US\$570 – US\$1400 for another firm. Most were in the approximate range of US\$430 – US\$1000 per day (depending on the level of skill and experience of the evaluator).

3.3 Demand-side capacity

Uganda

The demand and supply of evaluators continues to be driven by donors with limited country ownership of the processes. High-quality evaluations are more often commissioned and managed by donors than Government, which means that they are less likely to be used in policy.

A study done in Uganda in June 2009 by Ian C. Davies and found that demand for evaluative information in, and of the Government of Uganda, and resulting use, falls broadly into two categories; monitoring information for budget allocation and control purposes, and evaluation information to meet the accountability requirements. A key finding of the study was that there were significant gaps in organizational capacity for evaluation among MDAs.

In the MDAs there are no examples of written and institutionalized guidelines or standards on how to commission and manage evaluations. Skills, experience and know-how rest mainly with individuals and are not yet systematically institutionalized. There are also no systematic approaches to the building of capacity. Capacity building is rarely budgeted for and therefore ad hoc, based on individual initiatives.

Most of the staff in M&E units of MDAs have no certificate or diploma in M&E (Office of the Prime Minister, 2012) but have gained significant experience and on-the-job-training in M&E. However, they lack analytical capacities which hamper the development of the evaluative component. There is lack of evaluative capacity at decentralized level because of limited investment in M&E



capacity development. In fact, district level M&E is often considered to function merely as an outpost for central-level data collection and does not necessarily address local level implementation realities. Districts send quarterly work plans (for approval) and reports to the MDAs, yet hardly receive any feedback with respect to the data that was locally collected and channelled upwards (interviewees). Quality of data is barely controlled and is not analyzed locally for use in local-level decision-making which in itself discourages local level data collection.

The Ministry of Public Service does not have a detailed job description that specifies competencies in evaluation, i.e. knowledge, skills and abilities (KSA) for the position of Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. The job description for an Assistant Commissioner for Monitoring and Evaluation in a ministry does not contain minimum requirements for level of knowledge, skills and abilities for evaluation. The job description lists key areas of responsibility and outputs but makes no distinction between monitoring and evaluation.

This does not mean that individuals with responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation in MDAs do not have the abilities to carry out their work appropriately. On-the-job learning and training, together with access to documentation and opportunities for professional development outside of government, constitute ways in which evaluation capability is expanded. While institutional capacity for evaluation remains weak however, the risk is that evaluation practice, and its quality, can be affected by staff turnover. A 2009 World Bank document considers Uganda's capacity to monitor education indicators such as enrolment rates, number of teachers, infrastructure and instructional material to be relatively strong (World Bank, 2009).

Policy and Planning units and M&E units across government are generally understaffed and, in some cases, go for long -periods without staff being trained in evaluation or having access to professional development in M&E. There are a few cases in which unit with M&E responsibilities had no staff with skills and competencies to commission and manage evaluations. Local supply in many instances is more configured for monitoring of policies, programmes and projects, for example annual progress reports.

South Africa

As will be discussed in the section on barriers to entry below, there are weaknesses in the organisational capacity of DPME to create an appropriate enabling environment for supply. These weaknesses are likely to be more pronounced in the large number of DEP evaluations which could be coming onto the market in the next three years, due to the even weaker organisational capacity of departments (as opposed to DPME and the Offices of the Premier) to manage evaluations. DPME and many of the Offices of the Premier do not have the capacity to support all the departments in this regard, and there is a risk that many of the DEP evaluations will not have been adequately prepared when they go onto the market. In this context, suppliers may be



discerning regarding their choice of evaluations to tender for, and some departments might experience a shortage of supply for this reason.

All the donors in South Africa indicated that they do train their relevant staff on the management of evaluations. One of the donors indicated that they are now trying to reduce the number of evaluations that they carry out, because it is better to do fewer, better quality evaluations. The donor is also integrating evaluations more into programmes, rather than emphasising separate, independent evaluations. The reasons for this are to achieve stronger links with monitoring and to increase the evaluative culture amongst programme management staff.

3.3.2 *Barriers to entry*

Benin

Consultants interviewed were asked how best to strengthen capacity building to improve the supply side of evaluation services. Below are some of these responses:

- encourage training structures for supervisory staff in monitoring and evaluation;
- help young students from all fields to become interested in the practice of evaluation;
- emphasise the reconstruction of the theory of change in evaluations;
- clear, realistic and comprehensive terms of reference for evaluations;
- clear and precise eligibility conditions;
- transparency in the awarding procedures;
- promotion of accountability;
- strengthening of results-based management.

Consultants were also asked to present four of the most frequently encountered difficulties/problems in the provision of evaluation services. The following points were raised:

- difficulties in data collection
- difficulty in utilising specific data (not disaggregated by class, gender, etc.)
- unavailable or inaccessible documentation required to successfully monitor and evaluate programs or projects
- unavailable and unreachable respondents in evaluations (multiple appointments not honoured or ignored)
- An unreliable respondent is familiar with evaluation issues (contextual understanding)



- Mistrust of the evaluator by respondents
- Short and demanding turnaround times
- Late payment of consultant's fees
- Funder's control of evaluation process that affects the impartiality of results (jeopardizing the independence of evaluation).
- Evalu-phobia, this is the fear that the results and outcomes of the evaluation process will be used to punish (this raises problems with the evaluation culture in Benin).
- Poor communication between funders and consultants regarding expectations of the evaluation
- No feedback regarding not being selected for an evaluation
- Imposing and authoritative style of management by funders
- The inability of financiers to adequately manage the various stakeholders.

According to these respondents, government's terms of references are generally poor and lead to ambiguity in the scope of work. Donors were also accused in some cases of having similar issues as to a lesser extent than the government. This created unrealistic expectations for both the seekers and providers of evaluation services and ultimately resulted in an underestimation of the scope of work to be done. Poor communications by sponsors of evaluation services was also raised by suppliers. It was indicated by the respondents that at least a third of donors found difficulty communicating their expectations to consultants, whereas this is the case with government services in all cases.

Issues were also identified in the awarding of contracts or bids by respondents for both government and donors. In most cases, government's challenges were worse than donors'. The government was seen as providing little or no feedback in cases of short contractual deadlines for evaluation. Short or hasty contractual deadlines for evaluation were also identified as a challenge.

Unclear eligibility conditions was also raised by respondents. The details of the calls for tenders were generally presented in the form of a scoring system for technical and financial bids. These were intended to indicate the conditions of eligibility for the bids but were not clear.

According to all the consultants interviewed, the administrative processes of government's hiring and contracting processes were seen to be rather long. No apparent reason could be given for



this in the cases of both government and donors (although donors were slightly shorter than government). Consultants rarely received feedback on the application and selection processes.

Respondents raised several concerns regarding the administration of evaluations:

- Participatory and interactive management of the evaluation process was weak. This was particularly severe in the case of government and less with donor organisations.
- Micro-management by the client through interference in the evaluation process: the respondents indicated that this was generally the case for evaluation conducted by the government. In the case of donors funded evaluations, this was experienced in a little more than 50% of the time.
- Managerial and authoritative management style by funders. Respondents felt here that clients tended to be controlling and rigid in their management style of evaluation projects. This was said to be absolute in government-funded evaluations, whereas only about half the time in donor-funded evaluations.
- A change of scope and modification of objectives after the start of an evaluation was also said to be standard practice by funders of evaluation services. This resulted in an unclear and unrealistic change to the terms of reference, which made it too difficult to access donor data. This was raised as a significant hindrance to useful evaluations.
- Poor stakeholder engagement and management was recorded by respondents too. This is said to be common in both government and donor evaluations.
- Significant delays in obtaining approvals for evaluation deliverables and subsequent delays in payment. Several respondents criticised the setup and composition of steering committees. Once the evaluation process commenced, it became difficult to bring together these various committees. This ultimately affected the quality of deliverables.
- Difficulties in payment processing were also raised as a challenge here. The general financial systems within the public administration were identified as being crippling to evaluation services.

Uganda

There is potential rather than actual technical capacity to manage, undertake and demand evaluations. This is a major barrier to a more competitive demand and supply in the evaluation market. Local capacities for conducting high-quality evaluation are quite limited.



Impact evaluation of programmes is not designed from the outset (so a counterfactual is a challenge). Consequently, innovative methodologies are needed, the skills for which may be lacking.

The survey of individual evaluators indicates that most evaluators (88%) face evaluation market entry obstacles (i.e. ability to obtain appointments from clients to carry out evaluations). The obstacles include: unfair selection criteria, clients aim at experience which most Ugandans do not possess even when they have the required qualifications, most clients tend to think that fellow Ugandans can't do quality evaluations and thus give jobs to foreign evaluators, most clients don't want individual evaluators but prefer consultancy firms which are evaluated on the basis of experience for which foreign firms have an advantage, lack of adequate information linking evaluators to clients, and lack of Information on existing opportunities for those who are not connected with government bureaucrats, among others.

The survey of individual evaluators also indicates that most of evaluators (63%) have experienced challenges with the way their clients have managed evaluations (at any stage of the evaluation process including procurement and implementation). The challenges faced by individual evaluators include: reluctance to provide financial data and when they provide it is incomplete or delayed, procurement delays, poorly designed ToRs that lead to disagreements in the scope of the study results and findings, lack of adequate supervisory capacity, and international evaluator bias, among others.

Survey findings also show that clients had in most cases problems with the quality of evaluations done by suppliers. The problems include: unclear results from the project evaluation, long reports, poor documentation of success stories or impact of the project, estimations rather than facts, lack a proper methodology, poor depth of reporting and analysis of data collected, strong in quantitative and weak in qualitative and vice-versa, poor demonstration of impact with limited advanced analysis techniques, turnaround time, limited articulation of issues in line with sustainability and related indicators, weak illustrations of lessons and recommendations for both the project but also for future reference/projects, wrong data collected, unclear documentation of impact, inadequate triangulation of data, absence of standardized evaluation tools and guidelines, limited capacity, rigid and inflexible clients, much focus on methodology and limited focus on evaluation purpose among others.

Most clients experienced problems on particular aspects of evaluations, including: generation of gender disaggregated data, statistical analysis, methodology, qualitative analysis and presentation of the report.

In most cases, CSOs do not have a budget for M&E, except what is allocated for M&E from programme and project budgets. Consequently, the CSOs often have weak M&E systems in



place. Some CSOs have no M&E function; instead the responsibility to monitor and evaluate activities resides with project officers. Given the financial constraints facing CSOs, training of staff in M&E appears to be rare and occurs on an ad hoc basis.

CSO field-staff often lack the knowledge and skills to go beyond checking numbers, i.e. to appreciate the analytical dimension of evaluations and consequently what information is needed to answer questions about outcomes. When a commissioner of an evaluation in a CSO has poor knowledge and training in M&E, the person does not know what type of questions to ask, resulting in poor terms of reference. This spills over into poor management of evaluations, and consequently creates a risk of poor evaluations.

South Africa

A World Bank evaluation supply-side diagnostic revealed some structural issues that prohibit deeper access to the evaluation market via government evaluations. The eight suppliers interviewed by the World Bank had many positive things to say about their experience of evaluations managed by DPME, but also raised a number concerns, including:

- Bid requirements too restrictive
- Limited margins, sometimes actual costs much higher than pay (up to 200% higher)
- Funding/staffing required to prepare bid (3 weeks, R50,000)
- Timing too tight (for both bids and evaluations)
- Management of bids and evaluations too tedious
- “Subsidized” competition from universities
- TORs too broad, unrealistic
- Methodology very prescriptive
- Tight deadlines for evaluation, negatively affecting quality
- Data access problem affecting quality
- Process tedious, with high transaction costs, with no clear direction
- No feedback on bid, and feedback on evaluation contradictory, unconsolidated, and with unclear guidance
- Inadequate funding, and no visibility.

The World Bank diagnostic concludes that: *“The evaluation supply side has the potential to grow, based on the existing firms, market projections and potential, to meet international standards and to become a relevant export services market...Government, and DPME, has a great responsibility in how the evaluation supply side will grow.”*

The World Bank noted that the main request from suppliers is for predictability:



- on access to process and access to data for proposals preparation, and for evaluation implementation
- on the transparent selection of service providers and their proposals
- on the time and resources expected to be used on the implementation of an evaluation to make the process efficient and effective.

The World Bank made several specific recommendations to improve the enabling environment for supply, including for government to:

- a) make data more readily accessible to evaluators (this may not be possible where government has not kept adequate monitoring records during a programme, which is often the case, but in principle all available data should be provided to the evaluators)
- b) standardise and improve processes and procedures, including in procurement and quality control, to create greater consistency and transparency
- c) create more opportunities for suppliers to share experiences (including promoting supplier networks and more international exposure for local suppliers).

As will be discussed below, the interviews and online survey carried out for this diagnostic have identified the same challenges (as were found by the World Bank) experienced by suppliers when tendering for government evaluations. It appears that the South African government has made little progress in addressing these issues since 2014.

Some suppliers indicated that there has been some improvement in the quality of demand-side management and suppliers were generally appreciative of the work that has been done to put in place the national evaluation system. However, suppliers generally re-iterated the problems they experience with government clients which were identified by the World Bank diagnostic in 2014. Some suppliers indicated that there has been an improvement in the quality of terms of reference, but that the procurement process has become slower.

Problems experienced with government clients which were mentioned by suppliers during the interviews and workshops for this study and during the World Bank study include:

- unclear or unrealistic terms of reference
- excessive over-specification
- under-estimation of scope by the client
- poor communication of client expectations
- micro-management by the client



- ill-informed management by the client
- scope creep and changing goal-posts during an evaluation
- difficulty getting access to data from government
- unnecessarily short time-frames for the evaluation
- long delays in getting approvals for evaluation deliverables and subsequent delays in payment
- no feedback on reasons for not being successful in tenders
- inconsistent eligibility and evaluation criteria
- inability of the client to manage stakeholders
- chaotic management by some clients
- less enthusiasm for the evaluation in the line department than in DPME or the Office of the Premier
- having to work under evaluation steering committees with a lot of people who don't know what they are doing
- adversarial, autocratic and prescriptive management style from some government clients
- terms of reference for (unevaluatable) programmes without clear theories of change, for which it is not possible to retrofit theories of change due to a lack of consensus amongst stakeholders
- the lack of data in departments leading to a need to do primary research, but this not being catered for in the terms of reference
- evaluations being carried out for compliance purposes (after appointment, the client is 'out for lunch' and not available to engage with the evaluation).

Similarly, the individual evaluator respondents to the online survey identified the following challenges:

- Changes in scope
- Weak monitoring in clients, requiring additional work to be undertaken
- Terms of reference are not always clear
- Impossible timeframes, including for submission of proposals
- Clients not paying timeously



- Ringfencing of scope to create no-go areas of under-performance or to avoid placing a decision maker in a poor light. There are also times where there are attempts to exclude the less than optimum impact or causation / attribution findings. Especially when it could influence a follow-up programme or someone's performance agreement.
- Long procurement processes
- New entrants are not easily recognized nor given the chance to perform (clients prefer evaluators with 5 - 10 years).

Some suppliers indicated that they had incurred losses on NEP evaluations, largely due to the problems listed above. Some of the suppliers indicated that their reasons for continuing to tender for NEP evaluations, even though they are not profitable, are that they are important for exposure, that they are core to their purpose as evaluation organisations, and that they help them to engage with and understand the public sector.

Several suppliers indicated that they prefer to do evaluations for foundations, "non-profits" and multi-lateral institutions than for government, because they are better managed by the client and are less likely to be loss-making. One supplier indicated that "government evaluations always go over time and budget", due to the complexity of government systems, the large number of stakeholders, and due to government often being unable to manage stakeholders and scope.

Government procurement processes for evaluations were also identified as a reason for preferring to do evaluations for the non-government sector. Issues raised included:

- a) Government procurement processes are often very slow. Suppliers usually assemble a team (including associates as opposed to full-time employees) for an evaluation, and it is difficult to retain the team for months between the time of tender and the time of award
- b) Government treats suppliers as though they are just sitting and waiting for an appointment from government – suppliers are summonsed to interviews without checking their availability, and bidders often find it difficult to have their key people available on the date of the interview arbitrarily set by government
- c) Responding to government tenders is very time and resource-intensive, requiring the submission of a large quantity of information
- d) No feed-back is given on why tenders are unsuccessful. Several respondents had become despondent in this regard and indicated that they were no longer tendering because they did not know why they were always unsuccessful
- e) Wasteful processes are followed for the sake of compliance – for example, suppliers complained of being called for interviews 'to make up the numbers', while there is no real chance of them being awarded the tender



- f) Traditional government procurement processes treat every procurement as a 'clean-slate' engagement with suppliers – leaving no room to build up relationships with suppliers over time.

One of the university respondents indicated that they are no longer tendering for government evaluations due to the issues listed above and that they would prefer a 'memorandum of understanding' type of relationship with Government to do evaluations. They indicated that they have such relationships with other government departments, to carry out research on an as and when required basis, without having to go through a tendering process.

Another university respondent indicated that many university researchers may not be interested in doing evaluations from an academic point of view, because academia tends to be interested in global research boundaries, not operational government programme issues.

There was an indication that there is an increasing awareness of the need for evaluations amongst non-profits and that the non-profit market is growing (albeit not at the rate at which government demand might grow if there is substantial implementation of departmental evaluation plans). This implies that government will need to compete with non-government organisations for access to the better-quality suppliers, who prefer carrying out evaluations for non-government organisations, given the choice.

Several suppliers indicated that they thought that DPME's eligibility requirements relating to evaluation experience were unnecessarily onerous – more onerous than those of the large international private foundations that some of them are doing evaluations for. (Provinces and departments often copy and paste the DPME requirements into their evaluation terms of reference.)

A respondent from an international consulting firm indicated that they could bring people who meet the DPME experience requirements in from overseas, but this would be too expensive. The eligibility requirements thus appear to be an impediment to access to the South African government evaluation market for both emerging and large firms. It was also indicated that some of the other departments (not DPME) are requiring post-graduate evaluation qualifications as part of the eligibility requirements, but there are relatively few people with such qualifications in South Africa.

There was also a view from some of the suppliers that the projected increase in evaluation demand from government is not sufficiently convincing for suppliers to invest in additional capacity to meet the demand. Reasons given for this view included that only a small proportion of the evaluations in the provincial and departmental evaluation plans are implemented; that the



evaluations are often very small; and that the quality of the government procurement process is often very poor.

Some suppliers indicated that, if demand does indeed increase, they would initially increase their capacity by working with associates and part-time consultants. If the increase in demand is sustained, they might then look at increasing full-time internal capacity. Several of the suppliers indicated that they frequently sub-contract in expertise or additional capacity (for example to carry out field work) or form evaluation-specific associations with other firms or individuals where necessary.

Several suppliers indicated that, in general, DPME has more capacity for managing evaluations than other departments. Some suppliers indicated that they would no longer tender for evaluations for other departments because they have had very bad experiences with them.

However, some suppliers indicated that, while DPME has more capacity than other departments, its procurement and management of evaluations is also often very weak. Some indicated that, although they have done evaluations for DPME in the past, they had taken a decision to no longer do evaluations for DPME, due to past bad experiences. One supplier indicated that: “there is no shortage of evaluation firms, only a shortage of firms willing to work for government”. Nevertheless, some suppliers indicated that, notwithstanding all the challenges relating to government clients, they would continue to bid for government evaluations.

Some suppliers indicated that it would be much more attractive to tender once and then be on a framework contract than having to tender for each evaluation, given the effort required to produce each bid document.

Some suppliers indicated that tenders of a larger value are more attractive, but other suppliers indicated that the tender value is not so important, that the nature of the work is more important. If a small tender largely involves field work that would need to be outsourced, then it would not be worthwhile. If it largely involves work for which fees can be charged for internal staff, then it may be worthwhile.

One respondent who is both a supplier and a trainer raised strong concerns about the separation of evaluation and monitoring. The respondent argued that this is having the unintended consequence of furthering the false notion that evaluations can be usefully carried out if monitoring has not been done. It was argued that, no matter how much effort is put into evaluation, the quality of the evaluation will be severely limited if there has been little or no monitoring.

Supplier organisation respondents to the online survey listed the following obstacles to evaluation market entry (most of which were also identified in the interviews):



- a) Limited evaluation-specific degrees
- b) The financial cost of writing proposals and presenting them in person
- c) The fact that government's two-stage procurement system (functionality and price) does not incentivise quality
- d) That political principles and senior officials are hard to secure interviews with
- e) Budgets are low relative to expectations for scope and detail.

Only two of the thirteen supplier organisation respondents indicated that they have not experienced challenges with their clients. The types of challenges listed are like those identified in the interviews, including:

- a) *"Delays out of the evaluators' control"*
- b) *Line departments are very weak on evaluation knowledge*
- c) *Steering committees with no clear direction or understanding*
- d) *Insufficient recognition given to the complexity of some evaluations, and the time and effort required to collect the required information. Rather, emphasis is often on the process - getting deliverables in on time and in accordance with the ToR - and insufficient time and attention is given to working through the findings. As a result, the final stage of most evaluations tends to be very rushed*
- e) *There have been challenges related to scope creep and lack*
- f) *Unrealistic budgets and timeframes and expectations*
- g) *Data / information challenges*
- h) *Too many evaluation questions*
- i) *Clients not interested in evaluation findings*
- j) *Scope creep*
- k) *Resistance to learning and critical feedback*
- l) *Poor TOR*
- m) *Very poor monitoring data*
- n) *Many of the people responsible for commissioning and managing evaluations in the public sector have themselves never evaluated or have not evaluated recently. I think this lack of actual evaluation experience is to the detriment of public sector evaluations and the*



feedback received as there are expectations inconsistent with both the scope of work and realities faced by evaluators. With the exception of only one provincial government, I have found all evaluation project management to be considerably lacking. There is a total failure to stick to turnaround time commitments on the part of clients. In many instances shallow, contradictory or vaguely related comment follows and the substance of the evaluation is missed. My personal frustration is to receive comments originating from positions of power over the evaluator, where we are treated as "consultants" in the most derogatory sense and we are expected to answer, "how high" when the client says "jump". There are individual evaluation managers who are increasingly known among evaluators as being particularly difficult, unreliable or unreasonable. In my experience, evaluators are now consciously avoiding doing work for those individuals.

- o) I am able to choose my clients carefully. If they value evaluation feedback, do not complicate the evaluation processes unnecessarily and meet their payment obligations as per contract, I'm keen to work with them. Government, however, falls short on all three these criteria so I choose not to work with them.*

Solutions to these problems which were suggested by survey respondents were similar to those identified in the interviews and included changing procurement processes, developing the capacity of the client and clarifying the roles of the client and the evaluator.



4. Conclusions

4.1 Answering the research questions

As mentioned in the introduction, the methodological limitations of the research have meant that it has not been possible to answer some of the quantitative questions in the terms of reference, in all three countries. In addition, the process of carrying out the diagnostic raised questions as to whether it is possible to answer some of the quantitative questions at all, regardless of the research methodology.

A more in-depth and larger study could be undertaken to better quantify the supply and demand for evaluation. However, such a study might not produce different answers to this diagnostic in terms of answering the question: 'What should be done?'

By and large, the study does answer the main research question from the terms of reference:

What do we know of the capacity and supply of evaluators, and what is required to strengthen this capacity and supply?

It also at least partially answers the subsidiary questions:

How do we better match the supply to demand?

To what extent has the current approach to building an evaluation market constrained/enabled that market in each country?

What are the current patterns of evaluation implementation using external service providers versus the use of officials/public servants in government?"

4.2 The quantity of demand

Accurate quantitative measurement of the current and projected demand was difficult in all three countries, because:

- a) There are many organisations commissioning evaluations in the non-government sector. Some carry out evaluations frequently, some less frequently. Some issue open tenders for their evaluations, others do not. In all three countries, there is no existing database of past, current or projected non-government evaluations and it was beyond the scope of this study to create such a database.
- b) In all three countries, there is no comprehensive and accurate database of government evaluations, covering both those that are planned and those that are undertaken.

The conclusions that can be drawn related to the quantity of demand are:



- a) In all three countries, non-government demand for evaluations is strong and gradually increasing. In Benin, non-government demand is dominated by donors. The same is true for Uganda, but there is more demand from civil society organisations. In South Africa non-government demand is dominated by “not-for-profits” and international private foundations rather than donor countries.
- b) In Benin, government demand for evaluations is relatively small and has dropped in recent years. In Uganda, government demand for evaluations is linked to the number of large projects that are budgeted for and is stable. However, in South Africa there is a possibility of a large increase in government demand over the next three years - it could double or triple.

4.3 The quantity and quality of supply

In all three countries, it was not possible to accurately quantify supply. There are no comprehensive databases on suppliers. Nevertheless, it can be concluded that in Benin there is a pool of local consultants available for evaluations, largely working as individuals. In Uganda there is a larger and growing pool, including both individuals and consultancies, as well as substantial capacity in universities. The South African study pointed out that the supply market in South Africa is somewhat amorphous, with many consultants who carry out evaluations also doing other research or consulting work. The study indicated that the size of the supply market is partly dependent on the level and quality of demand.

In all three countries, it was found that local supply is generally sufficient to meet current levels of demand, in terms of both quantity and quality. In both Uganda and South Africa, suppliers indicated that they have capacity to take on more demand. However, in all three countries the demand for evaluation might increase in future and this could result in a need for increased local supply. There is also potential in Benin and Uganda for increasing use of local evaluators by donors.

One of the key findings of the research in all three countries is that the quality of demand has an impact on the quality and quantity of supply. In South Africa, there is evidence that some suppliers are choosing not to do evaluations for some government clients, due to problems with demand-side management of the evaluations. Government clients might therefore experience an apparent lack of supply which is due to suppliers choosing not to work for them, rather than being due to a real shortage of supply.

4.4 The quality of demand

The most important conclusion from this diagnostic is that if the governments of the three countries wish to develop the local supply base and reduce the risk of a shortage of supply in



future, they should focus primarily on improving the quality of government demand. This means improving the supply chain management of evaluations. The notion that the quantity and quality of supply is primarily dependent on the quality of demand is a fundamental principle of strategic sourcing, one of the main areas of supply chain management theory.

If government evaluations are going to be done independently, the management of evaluations becomes primarily an issue of supply chain management – i.e. procurement, contract management, project management and quality management. However, in all three countries, this research has identified extensive and similar problems with the supply chain management of government evaluations.

The studies in Uganda and South Africa both identified gaps in organisational capacity for managing evaluations in government. This lack of capacity covers both people with the required skills as well as management systems and processes. There is a lack of, or inadequate standardisation of methods for commissioning and managing evaluations. Both studies found that this lack of capacity is more pronounced at lower tiers of government.

It is apparent that government's current evaluation procurement and contract management processes coupled with some negative attitudes towards suppliers are resulting in a largely non-collaborative, often adversarial relationship between government clients and evaluation suppliers. By its nature, evaluation should be a collaboration between the client and supplier. The South African study found that the relationship between government clients and suppliers contrasts with that between private foundations and suppliers, which was reported by some of the suppliers to be a more collaborative relationship. Some suppliers indicated that the private foundations are more attractive clients for this reason.

Collaborative relationships between clients and suppliers imply a degree of deliberate 'co-production' of evaluations. Some suppliers indicated that they had been involved in collaborative evaluations with non-government clients which involved working together throughout the evaluation process, including joint definition of the scope of the evaluation.

4.5 Improving the representivity of supply

In Benin the pool of evaluators is almost exclusively male, while in Uganda it is largely male. In addition, in both Benin and Uganda, evaluation teams are usually led by foreign consultants. The key representivity issues in these two countries are therefore gender equity and increasing local participation.

The South African study found a higher level of participation of women in the evaluation supply market. The key representivity issue in South Africa is to increase participation of black evaluators and black-owned consultancies in the supply market. It was found that most of the students doing



post-graduate evaluation qualifications now are black, so the representivity of evaluators is likely to improve over time.

The South African study found that emerging black consulting firms which do evaluations are subjected to the same demand-side weaknesses as more established firms, but the emerging firms are more negatively impacted by these weaknesses than the established firms. For example, emerging firms are more negatively impacted by delays in payment or by long delays between the time of bidding and the time of award. The most important action that government can take to improve accessibility to emerging evaluation firms is therefore to improve its demand side management, in addition to putting in place other support measures such as access to mentoring, access to finance, peer advice and match-making mechanisms with larger suppliers.

4.6 Minimum competency requirements and professionalisation

While terms of reference for evaluations in all three countries have minimum requirements in terms of experience and qualification, there has not yet been standardisation of these requirements in any of the countries. This is partly due to a lack of consensus regarding minimum competency levels.

4.7 Training

The lack of consensus in all three countries as to the qualifications which should be possessed by a competent evaluator makes it difficult to draw conclusions regarding the training of evaluators.

In Benin there is relatively limited capacity for training in evaluation, but to date the country has been able to generate the skills needed to meet the demand. In Uganda there is more capacity for training in evaluation, and several evaluation capacity building initiatives or programmes have been implemented.

In South Africa, while there has been an increase in the numbers of public and private tertiary education institutions offering courses or modules in M&E, there are few post-graduate courses in evaluation, and these are over-subscribed. The financial difficulties facing the public higher education system in South Africa make it difficult for enrolments in this area to be increased.

In all three countries there is clearly a need for increased training of government officials involved in the commissioning, procurement and management of evaluations. Such training should be specifically aimed at addressing the demand-side weaknesses identified in this diagnostic report.



4.8 Pricing

Pricing levels in Uganda and Benin appear to be similar, with average charge-out rates of approximately US\$200 to US\$300 per day, depending on qualifications, experience, and skills scarcity. In South Africa the charge-out rates are generally higher, with average charge-out rates of approximately US\$200 to US\$700, going up to US\$1400.



5. Recommendations

- 5.1 In all three countries, there needs to be an ongoing process of strengthening the culture of evaluation.
- 5.2 The governments of the three countries should put in place and implement plans to address the demand-side shortcomings identified in this diagnostic report. This should include:
 - 5.2.1 Development of whole-of-government procurement strategies for evaluations. These strategies should aim to create a conducive environment for the growth of the local supply market. They could include procurement and contracting mechanisms to require the larger suppliers or international suppliers to subcontract local or emerging suppliers and to develop their capacity over a series of evaluations.
 - 5.2.2 Standardising the experience and qualification requirements in RFQs and tenders and the method of evaluating them
 - 5.2.3 Standardising as many other parts of the evaluation process as possible
 - 5.2.4 Possibly introducing evaluability assessments as a standard part of the evaluation process, to reduce the risk of evaluation failures and the risk of major scope changes after suppliers have been appointed.
 - 5.2.5 Training government evaluation managers to address the demand-side weaknesses.
- 5.3 In the absence of consensus on minimum eligibility requirements, formal professionalisation of evaluation should not be pursued.
- 5.4 More researchers in universities should be encouraged to do evaluations, to reduce the risk of supply not being able to meet demand.
- 5.5 The three governments should consider identifying a category of evaluations for internal implementation. This will assist in the development of both an internal evaluative culture and internal capacity for managing evaluations.
- 5.6 There should be a thorough assessment of the skills gaps (as opposed to generalisations about a lack of capacity), the results of which should be fed into the training sector in each of the three countries.



- 5.7 Country evaluation associations should be asked to arrange ‘match-making’ sessions or mechanisms between established or international and emerging or local evaluation companies. Central government departments responsible for evaluation could also set up such match-making mechanisms, but this could be risky from a procurement point of view.

These recommendations are clarified further below.

The development of the procurement strategy could become a further piece of work for Twende Mbele in a second phase of work on the supply and demand of evaluators. The procurement strategy should be informed by a demand market analysis, supply market analysis, client organisational analysis, and primary and secondary procurement objectives, including greater involvement and development of local or black-owned evaluation consultancies. Much of the information required for developing the procurement strategy is contained in this diagnostic report. The strategy should identify the most efficient and effective choices amongst the many options available for tendering procedures, packaging of the work, pricing methods, contracting methods and bid evaluation methods. One of the options to consider is three-year framework contracts, as used by some of the donor agencies. Such contracts could include compulsory subcontracting and supplier development requirements. This could enable continuous development of local or emerging suppliers over a sequence of evaluations over time.

To increase opportunities for new companies to enter the market, experience and qualification requirements should relate to individuals working for companies, rather than the companies themselves.

The World Bank diagnostic in South Africa identifies the evaluation preparation phase, the procurement process, quality control during evaluations and the role of the government evaluation manager during the evaluation as areas for improvement and potential standardisation.

There may be a need to reach consensus on the minimum competency requirements required for evaluators (this might need to be differentiated between different levels of evaluators and even different types of evaluation). Without defined minimum competency requirements, it is not possible to define skills gaps and to work with the education and training sector to address the skills gaps.

The advantages of carrying out internal evaluations is that it would reduce the risk of supply not being able to meet demand, as well as developing an evaluative culture within government and to improving evaluation management skills. The possibility of using experienced external advisors to assist with internal evaluations could be explored.





References

- Beyond 2015 Campaign, 2014. Citizen-led accountability: recommendations and key research findings for the post-2015 Agenda
- Bjorkman, Martina, and Jakob Svensson, 2009. Power to the People: Evidence From a Randomized Field Experiment on Community-Based Monitoring in Uganda. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124(2): 735-69
- BTC Uganda, 2012. Progress Report #2, Education Sector Budget Support (ESBS). Kampala: BTC Uganda
- Canadian Evaluation Society, 2014. Professionalizing Evaluation: A Global Perspective on Evaluator Competencies
- Davies, I, 2009. Mapping Evaluation Practice , Demand and Related Capacity Study, Office of the Prime Minister, Uganda
- DFID and CLEAR, 2014. Demand for and Supply of Evaluations in Selected Sub-Sahara African Countries
- DPME 2014 and 2017. Terms of Reference for the Panel of Professional Service Providers
- DPME, 2011. National Evaluation Policy Framework
- DPME, 2013. Presentation on reflections on the capacity development process supporting the South African National Evaluation System
- DPME, 2014. Evaluation Competency Framework for Government
- DPME, 2014. Standards for Evaluation in Government
- DPME, 2014. Taking evaluation forward in South Africa, presentation
- DPME, 2015. Departmental Evaluation Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20
- DPME, 2016. DPME draft Evaluation Competencies: Presentation to the joint SAMEA/DPME Evaluation Competencies Seminar
- DPME, undated. Job descriptions for evaluation posts
- DPME, undated. Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT): Evaluation Standard
- DPME, various, set of 11 Terms of References for evaluations
- DPME, various. National Evaluation Plans 2012/13 to 2017/18 – 2019/20



- Genesis, 2017. Evaluation of the National Evaluation System. Evaluation Report (final)
- Goldman, I. Mathe, J.E. Jacob, C. Hercules, A. Amisi, M. Buthelezi, T. Narsee, H. Ntakumba, S. Sadan, M. 2015. Developing South Africa's national evaluation policy and system: First lessons learned. African Evaluation Journal
- Goldman, I. Jacob, C. Maphalla, C. Moodley, N. Leslie, M. Kola, N. 2013. Quality assessment of government evaluations in South Africa – some initial findings, presentation to SAMEA
- Kyohairwe, S, 2014. Local democracy and public accountability in Uganda: the need for organizational learning. Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance. June 2014
- National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation, 2013. Office of the Prime Minister, Uganda.
- OECD, 2010. DAC Network on Development Evaluation, Towards a Strategic Approach for Evaluation Capacity Development
- Podems D. undated. What Makes a Competent Evaluator: What Makes an Evaluator Competent? Presentation to SAMEA conference
- Provincial Evaluation Plans, various. Provincial evaluation plans for Gauteng, Eastern Cape, KZN, Mpumalanga, Western Cape and Free State
- SAMEA and DPME, 2015 Concept Note: A Roadmap for a programme to strengthen evaluation in South Africa
- SAMEA presentations on professionalisation
- SAMEA, 2014. Draft Terms of Reference for a Feasibility Study on Professionalisation of Evaluation in South Africa
- SAMEA, 2015. Monitoring & Evaluation Accredited Course Offerings in South Africa 2015 version
- SAMEA, undated Monitoring & Evaluation Accredited Course Offerings in South Africa
- S.P., 2013. A Growing Demand for Monitoring and Evaluation in Africa. African Evaluation Journal 2013;1(1)
- UNDP, 2013. Solutions related to challenges of independence, credibility and use of evaluation: proceedings from the third international conference on national evaluation capacities
- Western Cape Department of Agriculture, undated. Implementation of the Departmental Evaluation Plan



World Bank, 2009. Project Appraisal Document for the proposed credit in the amount of SDR 99 Million (US\$ 150 Million Equivalent) to the Republic of Uganda for a Post Primary Education and Training Adaptable Program Lending (apl 1) Project in Support of the First Phase of the Uganda Post Primary Education and Training Program, March 5, 2009. Washington, DC.: World Bank

World Bank (IEG), 2014. The Changing Landscape of Development Evaluation Training: A Rapid Review

World Bank, 2014. South Africa: Evaluation Supply-Side Diagnostic: Analysis of Service-Providers (presentation to DPME)

World Bank (IEG), 2016. Evaluation 2030 What Does the Future Look Like?