REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Date of issue: October 23, 2017
RFP no.: DCA/RFP/003/17
Contract title: DI2013 Project Evaluation
Closing date: November 10, 2017
Contracting Authority: DanChurchAid, Great Lakes Regional Office, Kampala-Uganda

Contact person: Bob Olwol
Tel: +256312265594
Fax: nil
Email: bool@dca.dk

DANCHURCHAID INVITES YOU TO SUBMIT A PROPOSAL FOR ENDLINE PROJECT EVALUATION FOR A PROJECT ENTITLED “Strengthening of local climate change advocacy – making local voices heard in the climate debate”

TERMS OF REFERENCES

Country or region: Uganda
Programme title: ACT Alliance Uganda Forum
Project Title: Strengthening of local climate change advocacy – making local voices heard in the climate debate
Project period: 1st January 2015 – 31st December 2017
Time of the evaluation: 20 working days
Evaluation team:

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Background DanChurchAid (DCA) in Uganda
DanChurchAid (DCA) is a Danish humanitarian and development Non-governmental organisation established in 1922. DCA works in more than 30 countries in Africa, Eastern Europe, Central America, Middle East and Asia. DCA works in partnership and primarily through local partners (secular and faith based) and using a Gender Inclusive Rights Based Approach. DCA mission is to help and be advocates of oppressed, neglected and marginalised groups in poor countries and to strengthen their possibilities to live a life in dignity. DCA has worked in Uganda since 1979 and the geographical focus is Karamoja, Teso and the refugee hosting districts. DCA is a member of the ACT Alliance.
ACT Alliance is a global coalition of churches and church related Organizations doing humanitarian, development and advocacy work in over 140 Countries. Uganda Forum was formed with the main objective of increasing efficiency, effectiveness, visibility and impact of the ecumenical humanitarian emergency and development response through joint, implementation at national, regional and international levels. ACT Uganda forum upholds gender sensitive, rights and faith based approaches in the implementation of interventions. The current member Organizations include: Uganda Joint Christian Council, FinnChurchAid, RACOBASO, Lutheran World Federation, ICCO Cooperation, Diakonia Sweden, World Renew, Church of Uganda Planning Development and Rehabilitation, DanChurchAid, Lutheran World Relief, Bread for the World, Ecumenical Christian Loan Fund, Icelandic Church Aid, Church of Sweden, and Evangelical Lutheran Church of America.

1.2 Background about the project

ACT Alliance Uganda Forum through DCA secured funding from the Danish Civil Society Organisation - Civilsamfund i Udvikling (CISU) in 2014 to implement a project entitled “Strengthening of local climate change advocacy – making local voices heard in the climate debate” in the 15 Districts of Teso and Karamoja Region and with linkages to National, Regional and International scope engagements.

This project is jointly implemented by National members of the ACT Alliance Uganda Forum and faith-based partner organisations based in Teso and Karamoja sub-regions namely: Soroti Catholic Diocese Integrated Development Organisation (SOCADIDO), Teso Diocese Planning and Development Office (TEDDO), Caritas Kotido, Caritas Moroto and Pentecostal Assemblies of God – Karamoja Intergrated Development Program (PAG-KIDEP) in close collaboration with the local community and the district authorities targeted.

From inception, the duration of the project has been three years. It was officially launched in November 2014, and actual implementation started date of 01 January 2015 and an end date of 31 December 2017.

The project focus was to reduce climate change related vulnerabilities of the targeted communities. Climate Change has increasingly become global in character; threaten lives, destroyed properties and livelihoods. Disaster impacts have persistent long-term and negative effects on poverty and human development. Disasters - floods, landslides, epidemics and droughts - are an increasing serious and frequent threat in Uganda. It has undermined efforts towards poverty reduction by posing a serious threat to sustainable development for the poor in terms of food security and healthcare, especially to women and children.

Project equally focused on access and scaling of climate finance at national and international level; apriority for most other LDC countries as well, and this was implemented when advocacy and lobby initiatives related to national and international level were conducted. On national level
allocations was to be scaled, and enabling environments for foreign support and investments, was to be strengthened. Policy legislation and related decisions made by Parliament of Uganda which informed line ministerial budget statements was crucial areas of engagement in the project. In addition, the international debate about climate finance was most relevant hence our participation in the UNFCCC session to reinforce the position of Uganda, Low Developed Countries (LDCs) through inputs because LDCs generally have limited negotiation capacity compared to developed countries.

The overall Development Objective of the project is - Communities have access to climate finance to enable climate resilience, capacity to adapt to climate change and to choose a low carbon development path.

Specific objectives of the project:  
1. **Intervention Objective 1:** Capacity Building – The capacity of the faith actors in Uganda, especially ACT members and other faith partners of the intervention, as well as religious leaders, in Teso and Karamoja, to engage successfully in DRR and climate change advocacy has increased by 2017.


3. **Intervention Objective 3:** International Advocacy – Uganda is actively and successfully engaged in the UNFCC debates about climate finance

Targeted beneficiaries The project primary target was approximately 500 people who includes leaders of churches (e.g. the house of bishops, archbishop, the mothers union, nuns, catechists, clergy and others), communities and local governments, as well as leaders of community-based groups (e.g. Community-Managed Disaster Risk Reduction and farmer groups) working on disaster risk reduction or using climate change adaptation approaches. Furthermore, the primary target group include the faith-based organisations directly participating in the intervention, including the members of the ACT Forum Uganda, who received capacity building in advocacy.

ACT Alliance Uganda Forum through DanChurchAid is now desirous to commission an independent project evaluation in order to measure the project’s achievements against the targets as set out in the project log frame, as well as to measure the immediate changes experienced by communities as a result of the project against baseline values. The end of project evaluation will assess the extent to which the project objectives were achieved and also document best practices/approaches that can inform design of future livelihood enhancement projects and programmes.
2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

2.1 The objective of the evaluation
The overall objective of the evaluation is to establish the extent to which the outputs and impacts stated in the project Logical Frame work have been achieved as well as establishing the immediate and potential impact of the project on the community.

2.2 The purpose
DCA primary purpose of evaluations is learning, documentation and accountability, as such this evaluation is meant
1. To make an overall independent assessment about the performance of the project whether the outputs have been achieved and the extent to which these outputs contribute to the expected outcome and document any impact realised.
2. To identify key lessons and to propose practical recommendations for follow-up projects.
3. To establish to what extent the baseline findings have moved towards achievement of set targets detailed in the project’s log frame.

Specifically, the evaluation will seek to examine aspects around design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

2.3. Standard DCA programme evaluation questions
A separate chapter presenting the evaluation questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence and reasoning should be inserted. The organization of the report should be made around the responses to the Evaluation questions which are systematically covering the DCA evaluation criteria: design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. In such an approach, the criteria will be translated into specific questions. These questions should be derived from the project over all log frame.

2.3.1 RELEVANCE (PROBLEMS AND NEEDS)
The extent to which the objectives of the projects are consistent with beneficiaries, district local government and country needs. The analysis of relevance will focus on the following questions in relation to the design of the project:
- The extent to which stated objectives correctly address the identified problems and social needs
- The extent to which the nature of the problems originally identified have changed
- The extent to which objectives have been updated in order to adapt to changes in the context
- Adequate assessment of local implementation capacity
- Appropriateness of initial consultation with, and participation by local key stakeholders
- The quality of the identification of key stakeholders and target groups (including gender analysis and analysis of vulnerable groups) and of institutional capacity issues;
• Stakeholder participation in the management/implementation of the project, the level of local ownership, and issues of absorption capacity;

2.3.2 EFFECTIVENESS (ACHIEVEMENT OF PURPOSE)

The effectiveness criterion, concerns how far the project’s results were attained, and the project’s specific objective(s) achieved, or are expected to be achieved. The analysis of Effectiveness will therefore focus on such issues as:

• whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders (including communities, faith leaders, FBOs, Local government and National government);

• whether actual results match the performance targets set out initially

• whether intended primary target participated in the intervention

• Institutional reform projects, whether behavioural patterns have changed in the target groups at various levels; including communities and how far the changed institutional arrangements and characteristics have produced the planned improvements (e.g. in scaling finance, communications, adaptation actions and community wide resilience). The consultant shall capture quotations of success stories to back up this.

• How unintended results have affected the benefits received positively or negatively and could have been foreseen and managed.

• Whether any shortcomings were due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or overarching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation;

2.3.3 EFFICIENCY (SOUND MANAGEMENT AND VALUE FOR MONEY)

The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (sometimes referred to as outputs), in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned. The assessment of Efficiency will therefore focus on such issues as:

• the quality of day-to-day management, e.g. operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs),and management of the budget (including cost control and whether an inadequate budget was a factor); whether management of risk has been adequate, i.e. whether flexibility has been demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances and relations/coordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors;

• Extent to which the costs of the project have been justified by the benefits whether or not expressed in monetary terms in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences and eliminating market distortions.

• Technical assistance: how well did it help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results?

• Quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;

• Did any unplanned outputs arise from the activities so far?
2.3.4 IMPACT (ACHIEVEMENT OF WIDER EFFECTS IMPACT)

The term impact denotes the relationship between the project’s specific and overall objectives. At Impact level the final or ex-post evaluation will make an analysis of the following aspects:

- Extent to which the objectives of the project have been achieved as intended in particular the project planned overall objective.
- Whether the effects of the project:
  a) have been facilitated/constrained by external factors
  b) have produced any unintended or unexpected impacts and if so how have these affected the overall impact.
  c) have been facilitated/constrained by project/programme management, by coordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders
  d) have contributed to economic and social development
  e) have contributed to participation, adaptation and resilience
  f) have made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, good governance, conflict prevention including religious tolerance

2.3.5 SUSTAINABILITY (LIKELY CONTINUATION OF ACHIEVED RESULTS)

The sustainability criterion relates to whether the positive outcomes of the project and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding ends or non-funding support interventions (such as: policy dialogue, coordination).

The final evaluation will make an assessment of the prospects for the sustainability of benefits on basis of the following issues:

- The ownership of objectives and achievements, e.g. how far all stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and continue to remain in agreement;
- Policy support and how far the relevant national, sectoral and budgetary policies and priorities are affecting the project positively or adversely; and the level of support from governmental, public, business and civil society organizations.
- Institutional capacity, e.g. of the Government (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) and counterpart institutions; the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; whether counterparts have been properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;
- Socio-cultural factors, e.g. whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power-structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it sought to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it is based on an analysis of such factors, including target group/beneficiary participation in design and implementation; and the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities.
• Technical (technology) issues, e.g. whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service introduced or provided fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge.
• Wherever relevant, cross-cutting issues such as gender equity, environmental impact and good governance; were appropriately accounted for and managed from the outset of the project.

2.3.6 THE WAY FORWARD
What are the key recommendations for the design of the future new projects ACT Alliance Uganda forum based on the finding and learnings of the four thematic areas?
• How can synergies between ACT Alliance members, partners and the local-national level stakeholders be improved?
• In terms of methodologies and approaches, what suggestions can be made for improvement with regard to key methodologies and approaches (Faith based approaches) utilised?
• What elements/activities could/should be carried forward in the project in order to sustain the benefits and results of the ACT thematic areas?

3. Scope
The evaluation assignment is planned to take place Between November and December 2017 over a period of 20 days. The evaluation will seek to visit some of the Districts in Teso and Karamoja and will cover activities of the implementing partners in addition to National level activities.

4. Approach and Methodology
The evaluation approach shall be utilization focused; as such, the consultant(s) undertaking this exercise should arrange a workshop or individual meetings with individual intended users before, during and after the evaluation. ACT members, ACT partners; the relevant local government (district and sub county) departments, as well as targeted and none targeted users; have to be engaged to get feedback of the impact of the project. A debrief meeting to validate the findings and additional information before a final draft of the report is generated should be considered. The basis for this evaluation shall be the project proposal documents, including the log frame, the baseline and annual reviews and the various reports produced throughout the implementation period. The consultant will familiarise himself / herself with the project document and other relevant documentation. On the basis of that he/she will design an evaluation framework, evaluation questions and evaluation instruments, identifying critical stakeholders, parameters, questions and analytical tools and logistical requirements to measure relevant aspects that respond to the evaluation criteria. The framework and tools will be presented to DCA in an inception report within one week after commencement of the consultancy. Data collection will be done in...
a structured and systematic manner based on a random sample of stakeholders, covering all aspects of the intervention. Data from the various reports, the baseline and midterm review shall be verified in the field on the basis of semi structured interviews with beneficiaries, stakeholders and relevant staff. All findings will be systematically recorded and raw data kept for future reference by various stakeholders.

It is suggested that the consultant uses some of the tools below:

1. a rapid appraisal through a field visit and a series of interviews
2. a questionnaire survey involving a sample of beneficiaries
3. a series of focus groups involving beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries
4. a series of case studies

Preliminary findings shall be presented to DCA together with an outline of the draft report for approval and finalisation. The detailed steps are outlined in the next section.

4. Team composition

The consultant(s) undertaking this end of project evaluation shall recruit and remunerate his/her enumerators. For quality assurance of the data collection exercise and coordination at field level partner staff of the implementing organisations shall oversee the exercise at various locations. Nevertheless the consultant shall take lead in designing and approving the methodology in the targeted areas. This will include review and standardisation of the available household survey tools, review of available secondary data which will then be incorporated into the final survey report.

Skills and competencies of the consultant

- Excellent knowledge in climate change adaptation, mitigation, and resilience issues
- Proven expertise in the area of budget advocacy and analysis
- Experience in utilising tablet phones – Magpi for data collection is a Must.
- Extensive experience with evaluations, reporting and design processes, including skills such as indicator development, sampling, participatory evaluation methodology, appreciative enquiry methods, focus group interviews, etc.
- Proven expertise on the cross cutting issues such as Rights Based Approach and Gender.
- Posses skills in managing a consultancy process
- Proven team leader and report writing skills
- Knowledge of of the project implementation context - Karamoja and Teso
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills
- A minimum of 8 years of experience conducting related assignment

5. Timing and Outputs

The consultancy should take 20 person/working days with work expected to commence on 20th November 2017. All outputs are to be completed by 15 December 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>No. days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signing of contract and release of 1st fund instalment, Document review and prep</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work in Teso and Karamoja including review workshop</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compilation and Analysis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of 1st draft (DCA circulation with stakeholders)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting and submission of 2nd and final draft</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Working days</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultant will submit a draft survey document of not more than 25 pages (Times New Roman, font 12) to DCA for comments. A final version of the End report incorporating all stakeholders’ comments will be submitted to DCA office by 15 December 2017.

The consultant also provide the raw data presented in an Excel spreadsheet for storage and potential other usages by DCA.

The executive summary shall provide a quick overview of the evaluation, including the purpose and scope, the key evaluations questions, the methods used, as well as a brief summary of findings and recommendations. It should serves as a short stand-alone document that provides readers with all of the basic facts about the evaluation.

The main evaluation report shall be a detailed report. It should cover the purpose of the evaluation; information about the programmes, the context in which it operates/operated and it’s theory of change, the specific evaluation questions it set out to answer; data collection and analysis methodology (including the limitations of this methodology); who was involved in the evaluation; findings (including supporting data); and conclusions and recommendations. The report should be present in a jargon free language, which can be understood by a person who has not trained in research.

**Main deliverables/Outputs**

- A detailed evaluation methodology and matrix
- A brief debriefing note on the most significant findings and recommendations to be discussed in a debriefing session with the DCA Office
- An evaluation report in 1-3-25 format (see evaluation guideline)
- Raw data presented in an Excel spreadsheet for storage

**6. Coordination**

For technical direction the consultant will liaise with the ACT Advocacy Officer, Patriciah Roy Akullo prak@dca.dk and Head of Programmes, Christine Achieng chac@dca.dk.
For administration and final reporting, the consultant will liaise with the Country Director, Karin Elisabeth Lind keli@dca.dk and the Head of Finance, Susan Amot sua.uganda@dca.dk.

7. Application procedure
Applicants are required to submit the following:

- A Technical and financial Proposal: The financial proposal must indicate in Uganda shillings consultancy fee and a breakdown of expenses (unit price together with any other expenses) related to the assignment.
- Personal CVs of technical personnel proposed for this consultancy highlighting qualifications and experience in handling similar assignments.
- Work references: contact details of referees/firms for whom you’ve produced similar assignments).

All applications must be submitted electronically via e-mail bool@dca.dk; copy prak@dca.dkg and clearly indicate on the subject matter: ACT PROJECT EVALUATION. The deadline for submission of applications is 10th November 2017 by 5.00pm. Applications submitted late will not be considered.

Annex 2: proposal submission form

My financial proposal for my services is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reimbursable expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per diem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total reimbursable expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withholding tax (WHT) 15% (levied on professional fee). Please note that this is withheld from the contractor’s fee and not paid by DCA separately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total price incl. taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE OR COMPANY INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company (legal name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street name and no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL COMPANY INFORMATION**

| Year of establishment | Number of full time employees | Licensing authority | Licence number (VAT no./TAX id) | Countries with registered office: 
Registration Certificate – please attach | Does your company have CSR related policies in place – e.g. Health, Safety, HR, and Energy or Climate policy or is a member of Global Compact? Please state which policies. | Is your company e.g. ISO 26000/50001/14000 certified or SA8000 certified? Please state which. | Does your company have a Code of Conduct? |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

**REFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country of customer</th>
<th>Type of contract</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Contact name</th>
<th>Phone/fax and email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Include details of the experience and past performance on contracts of a similar nature within the past five years and information on other contracts in hand and/or future commitments including details of the actual and effective participation in each of such contracts, description of the Candidate’s assignments and periods of engagement. Additional documents can be attached to the above form.

The proposal is valid for a period of 30 days after the closing date in accordance with the article A.8. Validity.

After having read your Request for Proposal no. DCA/RFP/…/17 for Programme evaluation dated October 18, 2017, and after having examined the Request for Proposal, I/we hereby offer to execute and complete the services in conformity with all conditions in the Request for Proposal for the sum indicated in our financial proposal.

Further, I/we hereby:
- Accept, without restrictions, all the provisions in the Request for Proposal including the General Terms and Conditions for Service Contracts - Ver2 2012 and the draft Service Contract including all annexes.

- Provided that a contract is issued by the Contracting Authority I/we hereby commit to perform all services described in the Terms of Reference, Annex 1.

- Certify and attest compliance with eligibility criteria of article 33 of the General Terms and Conditions for Service - Ver2 2012.

- Certify and attest compliance with the Code of Conduct for Contractors in Annex 5.

The above declarations will become an integrated part of the Contract and misrepresentation will be regarded as grounds for termination.

Signature and stamp:

Signed by:

**The Candidate**
Name of the company:

Address:
Telephone no.

Email:

Name of contact person: