



Terms of Reference End of Bridging Phase Evaluation of the United Nations Joint Programme on Gender Based Violence

1. Introduction

UN Joint Programme on Gender Based Violence (JPGBV) in Uganda, funded by the Embassy of Norway, was launched in 2008 with Phase I to address the GBV issues in North and North Eastern regions in the country after the reduction of nearly 20 year era of violence and crimes including widespread and systematic sexual enslavement, rape, attacking civilians and abducting and enlisting children under the age of 15. The JPGBV was developed in this context to support the returning communities from mass displacements specifically focusing on the most vulnerable members of society, women and children. The programme was implemented in two phases.

Phase I of the joint programme was implemented by 3 UN agencies that is UNFPA, UNIFEM (currently UN Women) and FAO. Government of Uganda was represented by the Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development (MGLSD) and a consortium of seven NGO partners participated as implementing partners. In its second year of implementation, Phase I of the joint programme provided some important learning areas on GBV prevention and response, which informed the interventions for Phase II of the joint programme.

Phase II was built on those recommendations of phase I and took wider approach both in terms of programme interventions, implementing partners as well as a number of districts. Phase II of the UN Joint Programme on Gender Based Violence (UN JPGBV) took off in April 2011 with UNICEF joining UNFPA, UN Women and FAO to address violence against children. The MGLSD continued to be the key government line ministry coordinating and providing leadership on GBV related issues at national level linking directly with community service departments at district levels. The UN agencies and implementing partners involved also engaged directly with the local district government officials, such as Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs), Gender Officers (GOs), District Child Protection Units, and Community Development Officers (CDOs).

The JPGBV was scheduled to end i.e. 31st December 2013, however a No-cost extension was procured until June 2014. While the programme had an in-built exit strategy for sustainability of the interventions undertaken through increased participation of local government structures as well as CBOs, these capacity building efforts need medium to long term interventions to take root.

The proposed Bridging Programme 2015-2016 was proposed to ensure further strengthening of capacities of

the central and local governments together with the CBOs and the communities to mobilize and leverage local resources for a more sustainable approach. The bridging gap was also meant to consolidate the gains in the gender based violence multi-sectoral prevention and response in the North and North Eastern Uganda.

An evaluation was conducted for phase II and the report is available. The End of Bridging Phase Evaluation will be conducted following the process and guidance articulated in the UNFPA Evaluation Policy and the Handbook on how to design and conduct end of programme evaluation. The evaluation is expected to demonstrate high levels of objectivity and impartiality as reflected in the policy.

This TORs will be used to guide the evaluators in the design, field work and reporting aspects of the End of bridging programme evaluation.

2. Background

2.1. Context

In 2014, The Norwegian Embassy in Uganda approved funding worth **USD 7,412,910** (*Seven Million, four hundred and twelve, nine hundred and ten US dollars*) for United Nations Joint Programme on Gender Based Violence, involving a partnership of 4 UN Agencies (UNFPA, UNICEF, UN-WOMEN and FAO). The UN is implemented nationally (with MGLSD) and in 11 districts in northern and north-eastern Uganda. These include Gulu, Lira, Dokolo, Amuru, Pader, Kitgum, Amuria, Katakwi, Moroto, Kotido and Kaabong. The objective of the funding was to contribute to consolidating gains made in the Phase I and II programme on multisectoral GBV prevention and response efforts which started with phase I implemented from 2008 to 2010 and phase II from 2011 to 2014.

The bridging programme was designed in 2014 to respond to changes in the context necessitating the UN to fully align the new UNDAF (2016-2020) to government planning cycle, particularly the development of the National Development plan II (2015/2016 – 2019/2020). In addition, at the steering committee held in December 2013, it was noted that since the JPGE (DFID funded) was ending in December 2014, more time would be required to ensure a smooth transition to the one Gender equality/GBV program. Furthermore, JPGBV needed to be aligned to the priorities of the NDPII so as to ensure continuity of activities. Thus the bridging programme was approved for two years effective June 2014-June 2016.

The bridging programme was designed to respond to national priorities in line with the National Development Plan II (NDP: 2015/6-2019/20). This also in line with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF: 2015/6-2019/20) and the UN approach of Delivering as One (DaO).

The goal of the programme is to *contribute to sustainability of a gender based violence free society in Northern and North Eastern Uganda, where women and girls continue to be protected and empowered to assert their rights and are treated with dignity and respect.* The Programme Outcomes are:-

Outcome 1: Reduced social tolerance to Gender based violence in selected communities of Northern Uganda through community involvement and participation.

Outcome 2: A conducive legal and policy environment is created for strengthened accountability for GBV

Prevention and response for women and children

Outcome 3: Increased access to and availability of high quality and child friendly GBV response services for GBV survivors

Outcome 4: Strengthened partnership, learning, and coordination of GBV response in Northern Uganda

The bridging programme results was constructed highlighting the specific outputs and activities as well as indicators, baselines and targets for guiding assessment of performance under each of the programme outcomes. A baseline study was conducted before the start of the Bridging programme and a results matrix developed to guide implementation. It is upon this baseline that the evaluation will be conducted. The evaluation will focus on all four outcomes and will engage all four UN Agencies that are implementing the programme. *The results matrix is attached in Annex I.*

The bridging programme was implemented through Annual Work plans with a number of implementing partners (IPs) including government, civil society organizations at national and community levels. The disbursement of funds to IPs was based on quarterly work plan budgets, done on a quarterly basis. Reporting on the implementation of the work plan is done through joint quarterly coordination meetings, routine and joint monitoring visits by the implementing agencies. Annual review and planning meetings have also been conducted. The implementing partners also submit quarterly and annual reports which inform the consolidated overall programme reporting documentation.

3. Evaluation Purpose And Scope

a) Evaluation objectives

The main objective of the evaluation is to assess performance of the Joint Programme on Gender Based Violence and provide evidence of programme performance specific to achievement of planned results, provide accountability to stakeholders and provide lessons learned to inform the development of future related programmes.

Specific objectives are:

- i. To assess the extent to which the objectives of the bridging programme was aligned to the needs of the target population as expressed in government priorities, policies and strategies of various implementing agencies.
- ii. To assess the Joint Programme performance in achieving the programme outcomes, outputs and the programme contribution to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework results and the National Development Plan.
- iii. To determine the extent to which the implementation framework (Joint Implementation arrangements; Coordination; Human Resources; Resource Mobilization; and Monitoring and Evaluation) enabled or hindered achievement of the results chain, i.e. what worked well and what did not work well.

b) Evaluation Criteria:

The evaluators will assess the Joint Programme on GBV based on the UNDG in line with the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability.

c) **Time period and geographical coverage:** The scope of the evaluation will cover the Joint Programme GBV Bridging Phase implementation period from July 2014 to Date. It will also concentrate on areas where results are expected i.e. both at national and in the 11 focus districts. The districts are Amuria, Katakwi, Moroto, Kotido, Kaabong, Lira, Dokolo, Amuru, Pader, Kitgum and Gulu.

d) **Evaluation audience**

The audience for the evaluation includes UNFPA as administrative agent, UN partner agencies, Norway as the development partner, GoU (MGLSD) including district local governments, and other implementing partners.

4. Evaluation questions for programme focus areas

Evaluation questions will guide extracting required information from the stakeholders involved in JPGBV implementation. The general evaluation questions are associated with the evaluation criteria guiding evaluation of JPGBV. These include:-

Relevance: *The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are adapted to national needs (e.g., needs of the population, in particular vulnerable groups) and are aligned with government priorities as well as policies and strategies of UN in Uganda.*

- To what extent was the Joint Programme on GBV aligned or remained aligned to the objectives in United Nations Development Framework (UNDAF), Programmes of participating agencies and the National Development Plan 2015/16 – 2019/20 and responding to the national priorities? (i) How did the programme inform the UNDAF and NDP II? (ii) How have the programme objectives addressed identified rights and needs of women and girls in national and regional contexts? How much has the programme contributed to shaping women's rights priorities? (iii) What rights does the program advance under CEDAW, the Millennium Development Goals and other international commitments? (iv) How has the program contributed towards the achievement of MDG3 in Uganda? How is the programme contributing to the SDGs 1, 3, 5 and 16?
- To what extent is the Joint Programme support adapted (i) to the needs of the population (ii) capacity and systematic needs of government institutions (iii) and in line with the priorities set by the international and national policy frameworks?
- Assess the alignment of the JPGBV to the UNDAF and UNFPA coordination mechanisms

Effectiveness: *the degree of achievement of the outputs and the extent to which outputs have contributed to the achievement of the programme outcomes.*

The central focus of this evaluation is the outputs, specifically the extent to which the output indicator targets have been realised and how these contribute to the achievement of the outcomes. Gathering data on *actual outputs* and comparing them to what was expected (*planned outputs*) is the core aspect of the evaluation.

- To what extent were the expected outputs of the JP GBV achieved?
- To what extent were the targeted groups of beneficiaries reached through JP GBV support?
- To what extent did the JP GBV outputs contribute to the UNDAF outcomes both the 2010 – 2015 and the 2016 – 2020 UNDAF?
- What were the facilitating/limiting factors (partnerships, coordination, monitoring and evaluation, results based management) for the realization of JP GBV results?

- What were the constraints (e.g. political, practical, and bureaucratic) to addressing human rights and gender equality efficiently during implementation? What level of effort was made to overcome these challenges?
- What is the evidence that the program enabled the rights-holders to claim their rights more successfully and the duty-holders to perform their duties more efficiently?

Efficiency: *A measure of how resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results. Or the extent to which outputs and/or outcomes are achieved with the appropriate amount of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).*

- To what extent did the intervention mechanisms (financing instruments, administrative regulatory framework, staff, timing and procedures) foster or hinder the achievement of the programme outputs? This should also include assessment of timeliness in release of funds, implementation rates, reporting, fund utilisation rates etc.
- To what extent were JP GBV resources focused on a limited set of core activities likely to produce significant results?
- To what extent have the capacities of duty-bearers and rights-holders been strengthened?

Sustainability: *The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after its termination.*

- To what extent has the JP GBV been able to support partners and the beneficiaries in developing capacities and establishing mechanisms to ensure ownership and the durability of effects?
- To what extent were activities designed in a manner that ensured a reasonable handover to local partners? To what extent has national capacity been developed so that JP GBV may realistically plan progressive disengagement?

The evaluators are expected prepare a detailed Evaluation Matrix with specific questions for each of the result areas at the proposal and inception phase.

5. Evaluation questions on the Joint programme implementation modality

- a) **Coherence:** To what degree are actors working toward the same results, with a common understanding of the inter-relationships among interventions? To what degree are approaches such as human rights based approach to programming and results-based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion? To what degree are crosscutting strategies, such as capacity development, based on and pursued according to a common analysis? What is the added value of having a joint programme?
- b) **Management and Coordination:** How well are responsibilities delineated and implemented in complementary fashion? How well have coordination functions been fulfilled? What are the effects of co-ordination/lack of co-ordination on the programmes?

For each of the evaluation criteria, exploration of lessons learned which can be utilised to guide future programme development and implementation should be done.

A detailed evaluation matrix will be developed during the design phase of the evaluation.

For the selected result areas, the evaluation should also identify any **unintended outcomes** of the interventions.

6. Methodology

The methodology for the JP GBV Evaluation will include both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis approaches to generate credible findings and reach concrete conclusions. During the design phase, the evaluators will be required to develop tools for data collection and share with Evaluation reference group for approval. The evaluators should also propose analysis tools or techniques.

6.1 Data collection methods will include but not necessarily limited to

- Desk review and content analysis of key documents. This will include quantitative data collection and analysis.
- In depth interviews (structured and semi-structured) with key stakeholders (Implementing Partners, Beneficiaries, UN Agencies, Norwegian Embassy in Uganda, etc).
- Observations (including visits to selected project sites)
- Case studies
- Focus Group Discussions with programme partners and beneficiaries

a) Existing information sources

- Data should, where possible, be derived from programme reports, existing sources including from the Uganda Bureau of Statistics the Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries. The NGBVD and HMIS data are also a reference point.
- Reference documents include the baseline study undertaken in 2014 and the report of the Phase II end-term evaluation undertaken in 2013. Both reports provide detailed information on key programme indicators including those indicators that require survey. The indicator matrix showing baseline and mid-term values is attached (Annex 3).

b) Evaluation risks and assumptions:

- Latest data on high level indicators such as teenage pregnancy rate, GBV prevalence is only available from the 2011 UDHS, and only at national level.
- Coverage and completeness of reporting in the NGBVD and HMIS will affect most of the key indicator estimates for GBV Incidences.
- Some Implementing partners were changed at the start of the bridging phase and interventions started at different times in different districts, and for some of them, there has not been enough time to assess contribution to outputs.

6.2 Data Analysis: In the design phase evaluators will identify the methods for analyzing data. The focus of the data analysis process is the identification of evidence. Findings, conclusions and recommendations to be presented in the final evaluation report must be evidence-based. Evidence may be based on opinions and perceptions, and on hard data (values of the indicators in the JP GBV Programme). Data validation and triangulation mechanisms will also be agreed upon.

6.3 Evaluation Process

The evaluation process will comprise of preparation of an inception/design report that will comprehensively cover the design of the evaluation; field data collection and analysis; report writing approach; finalization of report; preparation of a management response; dissemination of the final report; and follow up on the implementation of the recommendations. The Evaluation Team will work in close consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group in each of the phases and steps of the entire evaluation process.

6.4 Expected output

The following products/services are expected from the evaluators.

- a) Design/inception report that is acceptable to the Evaluation Reference Group (maximum 20 pages)
- b) A debriefing presentation at the end of the field phase
- c) Draft Evaluation report at the end of field work
- d) Final Evaluation report (Maximum 50 pages plus annexes)
- e) Presentation of findings during the dissemination workshop.

c) Timing

- a. The duration of the contract is 60 days and expected to start from April to September 2016. All timings for outputs will be coordinated with the UN JP GBV Team.

The following is the preliminary, anticipated breakdown of the evaluation tasks.

Main Activities	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
Delivery of Design (Inception) report and Approval						
Field Work including data collection and Analysis						
Report Preparation and Validation						
Delivery of the Final Report and Dissemination						

d) Composition of the Evaluation Team and qualifications

A firm will be hired and should present a team with the following expertise. Team leader should have core competencies in multi sectoral Gender Based Violence prevention and response. In addition, have the PHD in gender studies. The members of the research team should have a minimum of Master's Degree in Gender, Reproductive Health, and agricultural economist or any other relevant field. The team is expected to have

- Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies
- Experience in conducting similar assignments especially for UNFPA and/or other UN/international Development Agency
- Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking and policy advice
- Strong analysis and reporting skills
- Must be committed to respecting deadlines of delivery of outputs within the agreed time frame;
- Must be able to work in a multidisciplinary team
- Excellent facilitation skills
- Fluent in English

e) Management of the Evaluation

i. Role of the JP GBV Coordination Unit

- Lead development of the ToR in consultation of the M&E Units of different agencies.
- Support the evaluation reference group meetings
- Manage the evaluation budget and ensure logistical and administrative support
- Facilitate access to programme background documents
- Provide ongoing feedback for quality assurance during the preparation of the design report and the final report

ii. Evaluation Reference Group (comprising of Gov't, JP GBV UN agencies and Norwegian Embassy representative)

The composition of the Reference Group is as reflected in Table 1. The Reference Group will be responsible for the following:

- Review the Terms of Reference
- Ensure consensus on evaluation design, evaluation recruitment, roles and responsibilities of UN partners;
- Select and debrief evaluation team
- Arrange meetings with key stakeholders to discuss drafts of the evaluation reports;
- Organize technical support and provide continual feedback during the evaluation process
- Approve inception report and final evaluation budget
- Monitor progress and quality of evaluation activities
- Verify the quality, integrity and relevance of the final evaluation report and approve evaluation reports
- Ensure discussion of evaluation findings and recommendations with all major stakeholders and agreement on a follow-up plan of action

Table xx: Composition of the Evaluation reference Group

	Organisation and designation	Name
1.	Norwegian Embassy	
2.	Coordinator - JP GBV	
3.	UNFPA M&E	
4.	UNFPA Programme	
5.	UNICEF M&E	
6.	UNICEF Programme	
7.	UN Women M&E	
8.	UN Women Programme	
9.	FAO Programme	
10.	FAO M&E	
11.	MGLSD M&E	
12.	MGLSD Programme	
13.	Min of Health- M&E	
14.	Min of Health Programme	
	Min. of Agriculture	

f) Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria

The technical bid is evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Terms of Reference and the evaluation criteria. The obtainable number of points specified for each evaluation criterion indicates the relative significance or weight of the item in the overall evaluation process. The following is the Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria.

	Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Attained by Bidder
A	Technical approach, methodology and level of understanding of the objectives of the evaluation	19	
B	Work plan/time scales given in the proposal and its adequacy to meet the evaluation objectives and questions	12	
C	Prior experience of handling projects of this nature (examples of similar services provided, references, etc.)	32	
D	Professional experience of the staff that will be employed to the project proving demonstrated expertise in evaluation and related processes (CVs, etc.)	37	
TOTAL		100	

Annex 1: RESULTS MATRIX

UN JOINT PROGRAMME ON GENDER BASED VIOLENCE (2014-2016)

RESULT MATRIX

Goal/Outcome/ Output	Indicator	Means of Verification	Data gathering			
			Method	Frequency	Responsible	Assumptions/ risks
Goal: A gender based violence free society in Northern Uganda, where women and girls are protected, empowered to	Incidence of GBV cases in the target districts BASELINE: North: 50.7% (F-42%; M-59.3%) Karamoja: 43.3% (F-43.9%; M-42.7%) TARGET North: 48% Karamoja: 40%	JP GBV Survey Report	KAP Survey	Once (2016)	UNFPA	Peace continues to prevail in Acholi, Lango, Teso and Karamoja

assert their rights and treated with dignity and respect						
Outcome 1: Reduced social tolerance to Gender based violence in selected communities of Northern Uganda	Percentage of the population of men and women (15 – 49 years) in the target sub-regions who agree that a husband is justified to beat his wife for at least one of the five specified reasons ¹ BASELINE: North: 27%; Karamoja: 29% TARGET North: 18%; Karamoja: 26%	JP GBV Survey Report	KAP Survey	Once (2016)	UNFPA	There will be capacity and political commitment of central and local government authorities to take on the responsibilities for GBV programming
Output 1.1. Increased knowledge and awareness of GBV prevention and response among targeted communities, including knowledge and application of the new laws on GBV	Percentage of population in the target districts who mention at least 2 ways to prevent GBV and at least 2 ways to respond to GBV BASELINE: North: 89%; Karamoja: 80% TARGET North: 95%; Karamoja: 85% Number of people reached with GBV prevention and response messages Target: 1,211,680 Number of dialogue meetings held	Community members in target districts	KAP survey	Twice (at start and end of programme)	UNFPA	

¹ Specified reasons: - She burns the food, if she argues with him, if she goes out without telling him, if she neglects the children, and if she refuses to have sexual intercourse with him

	<p>Target: 352 (2 per Qtr per S/C per District)</p> <p>Number of people in the targeted population participating in the community dialogue Target: 9,120 (2 dialogues per qtr, in 57 sub counties with 20 ppts each)</p> <p>2 Divisions with functional capacity for GBV prevention and response.</p> <p>Number of radio talk shows Target: 88 (2 per qtr in 11 district) Radio talk shows Target: 2,500,000 (coverage of radios that is wider than the program coverage) Estimated number of listenership</p> <p>Number of events and people reached with GBV messages, Target: 2 events per district, Average of 2000 people reached per district per event.</p> <p>Policy and political commitments on the promotion of reproductive rights and prevention of GBV secured. Target:03</p> <p>Number of IPs and district gender focal persons trained on SASA Target: 40 (3 districts plus select participants)</p> <p>Number of CAs mentored. Target: 500 CAs mentored</p> <p>Number of people reached Target: 225000</p>					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>(each CA reaching 10 per week for the year)</p> <p>Number of newly elected leaders, cultural and religious leaders trained Target: 1650 (550 cultural, 550 Political, 550 religious)</p> <p>Number of peer educators mentored and supported Target: 900 in of schools and 300 out of schools mentored</p> <p>Number of youths reached by peers Target: 60,000 youths reached (1200 peers @ reaching 50 in 1 year)</p> <p>Reduced number of pregnancy among teenagers Number of senior women and male teachers trained Target: 440</p> <p>Number of peer educators trained Target: 440</p>					
<p>Output 1.2. Increased knowledge of the GBV legal and policy framework and response among community leaders (cultural, political, religious, duty bearers)</p>	<p>Percentage of community leaders in the target districts who have basic knowledge of at least 2 legal/policy frameworks that address SGBV</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 73%; Karamoja: 15%</p> <p>TARGET North: 80%; Karamoja: 30%</p> <p>Number of community leaders oriented on GBV legal/policy framework Target: 1650 (550 cultural, 550 Political, 550 religious)</p>	Community leaders in target districts	KAP survey	Twice (at start and end of programme)	UNFPA, UNICEF, FAO, UN WOMEN	

	<p>Number of elected councillors trained to develop anti GBV byelaws and ordinances Target: 55 (5 per district)</p>					
	<p>No of byelaws and Ordinances passed and implemented that safe guard women's rights and reduction in GBV</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 3; Karamoja: 1 TARGET North: 7; Karamoja: 2</p>	Quarterly and Annual reports	Reviews of Reports	Quarterly and Annual	UNFPA, UN WOMEN	
<p>Output 1.3. Enhanced male engagement in GBV prevention and response in targeted communities</p>	<p>Percentage of target sub-counties in target districts with Male Action Groups active in GBV prevention and Response activities</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 51%; Karamoja: 37% TARGET North: 56%; Karamoja: 41%</p> <p>Number of functional male action groups in the targeted sub counties Target: 57 Sub counties</p> <p>Number of male action groups trained Target: 57 Action groups trained</p> <p>Number of men and boys reached by the male action groups Target: 68,400 (each MAG will reach 5 men/boys per month in a year)</p>	Quarterly and Annual reports	Review of SASA reports	Quarterly and Annual	UNFPA	
<p>Output 1.4. Increased economic opportunities</p>	<p>1.4.1: Household dietary diversity score among targeted households BASELINE: North: 5.7 (Acholi/Lango =5.2,</p>	Target women	Household Survey	Annual	FAO	

<p>and food security among target women.</p>	<p>Teso = 6.2) ; Karamoja: 3.8 TARGET: North: 6.7 ; Karamoja: 4.8</p> <p>Percentage of households where members are knowledgeable and using better agronomic practices Target: 45%</p> <p>1.4.2: % of HHs where women contribute to HH income: BASELINE: <i>Crops - 56%; Casual labour - 16%; Livestock - 16%; Brewing - 22%; Firewood - 16%; Charcoal - 11%; Trading - 5%</i> TARGET: Crops = 76%; Livestock = 36%</p> <p>Percentage of households where members are knowledgeable and having skills on income generation Target: 80% Measurable improvement in access to and control of productive resources Target: 3 (on a scale of 1-5)</p>					
	<p>Percentage of targeted women who are able to generate income to sustain themselves and their families;</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 22%; Karamoja: 38% TARGET North: 42%; Karamoja: 44%</p> <p>1.4.2: Level of income generated from sustainable economic activities among targeted households (disaggregated by sex)</p>	Target women	Household Survey	Annual	UNFPA,FAO,UN WOMEN	

	<p>BASELINE[3]: North: Crop Production = UGX.679,796 ; Livestock Production = UGX.163,719 ; Enterprise (trading) = UGX.116,325;</p> <p>Karamoja: Crop production = UGX.31, 243; Livestock production = UGX.81, 810; Enterprise (trading) = UGX. 20,750</p> <p>TARGET: North: Crop Production = UGX. 747,776; Livestock Production = UGX. 171,905; Enterprise (trading) = UGX. 122,141</p> <p>Karamoja: Crop production = UGX. 33,742; Livestock production = UGX. 84,264; Enterprise (trading) = UGX. 21,373</p> <p>Percentage of households whose members jointly participate in decision making on production and consumption Target: 40%</p> <p>Proportion of households whose members are knowledgeable on the roles of men, women, boys and girls Target: 80%</p>					
<p>Outcome 2: A conducive legal and policy environment is created for strengthened accountability</p>	<p>GBV and Child abuse case diversion rate by the Police in the target districts</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 30%; Karamoja: 12% TARGET North: 15%; Karamoja: 11%</p>	<p>Administrative records at Police headquarters in target districts</p>	<p>Document review</p>	<p>Annual</p>	<p>UNICEF UNFPA,</p>	<p>There will be capacity and political commitment of central and local government authorities to take on the responsibilities for</p>

<p>for GBV prevention and response for women and children</p>	<p>SGBV and child abuse case disposal rate at the magistrate's and high courts in the target districts</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 19%; Karamoja: 20% TARGET North: 38%; Karamoja: 22%</p>	<p>Administrative records at magistrate's and high courts in target district</p>		<p>Annual</p>	<p>UNICEF UNFPA,</p>	<p>GBV programming</p>
<p>Output 2.1: The capacity of the Police and Courts in the target districts to handle cases of GBV is strengthened</p>	<p>Percentage of personnel (Judiciary, magistrates, medical personnel, the Uganda Police Force) with capacity (trained and with tools) on investigating and prosecuting GBV cases.</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 33%; Karamoja: 25% TARGET North: 60%; Karamoja: 50%</p> <p>Percentage % of JLOS and medical staff to managing GBV and child related cases according to the national standards</p> <p>No. JLOS and medical staff trained to handle GBV and Children related cases</p> <p>No of GBV and children related cases handled North 60% of target JLOS staff trained on GBV and Children related cases Karamoja</p> <p>50% of JLOS and medical staff trained to manage GBV and Children related cases</p> <p>80% usage of GBB</p>	<p>Target duty bearers</p>	<p>Survey/Document Review</p>	<p>Annual</p>	<p>UNFPA, UNICEF, FAO, UN WOMEN</p>	

	<p>No. of JLOS institutions meeting quality set standards for handling GBV and child related cases Target North: - 50% Karamoja – 25%</p> <p>No. of functional DCCs and RCCs Target North: 8 districts Gulu, Amuru, Kitgum, Pader, Katakwi, Amuria, Lira and Dokolo North: Karamoja: 3 districts of Karamoja</p> <p>DDP handbook on GBV Juvenile Justice finalised and in use Target:1 handbook finalised</p> <p>Percentage of Chief Magistrates/high court with child holding spaces that provide counselling and Child –friendly materials Target: 10% of Chief Magistrates/high court with functional child holding spaces (extending Counselling and child-friendly materials to children)</p> <p>No of targeted duty bearers applying laws (knowledge acquired) for GBV and VAC, medical and psychosocial services in the target district Target: 60% formal and informal duty bearers knowledgeable on laws for GBV, VAC</p> <p>Percentage GBV and child survivors accessing quality services Target: 30%</p> <p>No. of functional GBV and child protection shelters Target: number tbc</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Evidence Act as amended Target: 1 Percentage of police stations with original PF3 Target: 80%					
Outcome 3: Increased access to and availability of high quality and child friendly GBV response services for GBV survivors	Number of children receiving protection services from IPs in the target districts annually BASELINE: North: 321; Karamoja: 500 TARGET North: 321; Karamoja: 500	Administrative records of Implementing Partner	Document reviews	Annual	UNFPA, UN ICFE	Peace continues to prevail in Acholi, Lango, Teso and Karamoja region even in the absence of the final peace agreement and that former IDPs will continue to return home where interventions sought under this programme will be implemented, contributing to achievement of durable solutions
	Percentage of women receiving timely medical-legal aid from service providers in the target districts BASELINE: North: 19%; Karamoja: 38% TARGET North: 30%; Karamoja: 48%	Administrative records of Implementing Partner	Document reviews	Annual	UNFPA, UN ICFE, UN WOMEN	
Output 3.1. The provision of child protection services in the target districts is strengthened	Number of service centers in target districts providing child friendly services to children that have been operational for at least the last six months BASELINE: North: 4; Karamoja: 1 TARGET North: 6; Karamoja: 2 No. joint trainings per district,	Administrative records of target District Local governments	Document reviews	Quarterly, Annual	UNFPA, UN ICFE, FAO, UN WOMEN	

	<p>Target:2 per district,</p> <p>No. of service providers reached per district, Target: 40 per district (20 Per session per district)</p> <p>Target: national child helpline fully functioning</p>					
<p>Output 3.2. The Provision of GBV services (psychosocial, medical, legal) in the targeted districts is strengthened</p>	<p>Number of service centers in target districts providing GBV support services to women and girls that have been operational for at least the last six months</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 4; Karamoja: 1 TARGET North: 6; Karamoja: 2</p> <p>No. of Mapping exercises conducted- No. of service providers identified Target: 2 regional mapping</p> <p>No. of service providers trained Target: 20 per district</p> <p>No. of cases followed up in each district Target: 100 cases per district</p>	Administrative records of Distrcit Local governments	Document reviews	Annual	UNFPA,UNICEF,UNWOMEN	
	<p>Percentage of GBV cases in targeted districts handled in compliance of Domestic Violence Act regulations</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 31%; Karamoja: 12%</p>	Administrative records of Distrcit Local governments	Document reviews	Annual	UNFPA,UNICEF,UNWOMEN	

<p>TARGET North: 62%; Karamoja: 24%</p> <p>No. of Mapping exercises conducted- No. of service providers identified Target: 2 regional mapping</p> <p>No. of service providers trained Target: 20 per district</p> <p>No. of cases followed up in each district Target: 100 cases per district</p> <p>No. OF Health service providers trained on Clinical Mgt Target: 275 HW</p> <p>No. Mentoring Visits made, Target: 4 @ District, No. Targeted HWs Mentored, Target: (15HWs *11 district* 2 Bi-annual) = 330Hws,</p> <p>No. Health facilities Reached with functional data mgt Systems in the target Districts, Target: (5H/Fs *11Dist*2)=110 Facilities</p> <p>No. Facilities equipped with the Necessary Clinical Mgt Tools procured and distributed to the target facilities Target: 110 Facilities (10 Facilities per district)</p> <p>No. HWs Trained Target:220 Hw (2 @ 10 targeted facility* 11 Target Districts</p> <p>No. of follow up visits conducted</p>					
---	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Target:4 visits per district</p> <p>No. of mentors mentored in the TOT centrally Target: 22 MENTORS</p> <p>Districts with functional GBV data management systems Target:11</p> <p>No. of sensitisation rounds conducted Target:22</p> <p>No. of service providers sensitised Target:-110 service providers (10*11 Districts)</p>					
Outcome 4.0 Strengthened partnership, learning, and coordination of GBV response in Northern Uganda	<p>Number of districts with GBV prevention and response interventions integrated into district plans</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 10; Karamoja: 3 TARGET North: 10; Karamoja: 3</p> <p>Number of staff from CSOs and FBOs Oriented on NGBVD. Target: 40 Staff (disaggregated data)</p> <p>Number of districts officers trained Target: 8 per district</p> <p>Upgraded NGBVD with case management Target: 12</p> <p>Technical support to NGBVD Target: 01 Officer</p>	District Local governments	Document reviews	Annual	UNFPA/MG LSD	Staff turnover will take place in participating organizations and agencies and government, hence eroding institutional memory

	Functional GBV Help line Target: 01					
	<p>Number of districts with functional GBV coordination mechanism (GBV reference group meetings, Workplans, decisions)</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 8; Karamoja: 3</p> <p>TARGET North: 8; Karamoja: 3</p> <p>Existence of functional GBV coordination mechanism (ToR, work plans, regular meetings and minutes, monitoring reports, SOPs and referral pathways) in development and humanitarian settings Target: 11 JPGBV districts</p> <p>Action plans from the review meetings. Target: Biannual meetings 7 District action plans supported.</p> <p>Effective and efficient implementation of planned activities. * 98% fund absorption rate *75% of quarterly reports submitted in time. *Maximum of 5% OFA.</p> <p>Number of District and sub county plans that allocate funds to GBV Initiatives. Target: 2% increment of budgetary allocations.</p>	Quarterly and Annual reports	Document reviews	Quarterly and Annual	UNFPA/MG LSD	

	<p>Number of periodic reviews and reports for GBV JP programme</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 1; Karamoja: 2 TARGET North: 4; Karamoja: 4</p> <p>Effective and efficient implementation of planned activities. Target: Quarterly meetings</p> <p>End of JPGBV Programme evaluation report. Target: 01 Evaluation</p>	<p>Quarterly and Annual reports</p>	<p>Document reviews</p>	<p>Quarterly and Annual</p>	<p>UNFPA</p>	
	<p>Number of Good practices Documented and Disseminated</p> <p>BASELINE: North: 1; Karamoja: 2 TARGET North: 4; Karamoja: 4</p>	<p>Quarterly and Annual reports</p>	<p>Document reviews</p>	<p>Quarterly and Annual</p>	<p>UNFPA/MG LSD</p>	

1. Technical evaluation Criteria

1.1. The Technical Bid is evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Terms of Reference, the Technical Bids submitted by the Bidders and the evaluation criteria published below.

Criteria	[A] Maximum Points	[B] Points attained by the Bidder	[C] Weighting %	[B] x [C] = [D] Total Points
Qualifications of the Consultancy Team (attach CVs of at least 3 key personnel, including Team Leader).	100		10%	
Specific experience of the Consultancy Team (attach CVs of at least 3 key personnel, including Team Leader).	100		10%	
Team Leader should have specific experience in leading multi-disciplinary teams and managing similar projects	100		5%	
Specific relevant experience of the Company	100		10%	
Understanding of the assignment (the offeror clearly understands the requested tasks, the objective of the assignment and a description of how the offeror proposes to undertake the assignment	100		25%	
Study method proposed: Appropriateness of the study approach in line with the objectives of the assessment.	100		25%	

A clear and appropriate data analysis plan, including Quality Assurance Plan	100		15%	
GRAND TOTAL ALL CRITERIA	<u>700</u>		100%	

2. Financial evaluation

- 2.1. The Financial Bid will only be evaluated if the Technical Bid achieves a minimum score of 60% of the points and is considered qualified through the supplier qualification process. Proposals failing to obtain this minimum technical threshold or those which will not be considered qualified through the supplier qualification process will not be eligible for further consideration.
- 2.2. The Financial Bid is evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness in Price. The maximum number of points for the Financial Bid is 100. This maximum number of points will be allocated to the lowest price. All other Financial Bids will receive points in inverse proportion according to the following formula:

$$\text{Financial Score} = \frac{\text{Lowest Bid (\$)}}{\text{Bid being Scored (\$)}} \times 100 \text{ (Maximum Score)}$$

3. Total score

- 3.1. The total score for each Bidder will be the weighted sum of the technical score and financial score. The maximum total score is 100 points.

$$\text{Total Score} = 60\% \text{ Technical Score} + 40\% \text{ Financial Score}$$

AWARD OF CONTRACT AND FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. Award of Contract

- 4.1. UNFPA shall award the Contract for Professional Services to the Bidder(s) that obtains the highest combined score of the Technical and Financial evaluation