

**ASF IS LOOKING FOR A CONSULTANT FOR THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT  
"FROM ACCESS TO EQUALITY: EMPOWERING WOMEN TO ACCESS JUSTICE IN UGANDA"**

<b>Project</b>	From Access to Equality: Empowering women to access justice in Uganda (FATE).
<b>Objective of the assignment</b>	To conduct a final evaluation of the FATE project
<b>Profile of the consultant</b>	<p>The consultant or lead consultant should have the following academic qualifications, professional experience and skills:</p> <p><b>Academic Qualifications</b></p> <p>Master's degree in law, statistics, development studies Monitoring and Evaluation, social sciences, international development, political sciences and/or human rights or any relevant field.</p> <p><b>Professional experience</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extensive experience working on rights-based programming and access to justice projects, specifically within the context of Uganda.</li> <li>2. A minimum of 7 years' of working experience in project evaluation, preferably in the access to justice sector.</li> <li>3. Proven familiarity with contextual knowledge of, and practical experience working in Uganda. The strong emphasis on "experience working on rights-based programming and access to justice projects in the context of Uganda" and "familiarity, contextual knowledge of and experience working in Uganda" indicates that ASF prioritizes thematic and local expertise over generic evaluation skills. This suggests that the quality of the evaluation will heavily</li> </ol>

	<p>rely on the consultant's ability to understand the nuances of the local justice system and gender dynamics, ensuring that findings and recommendations are practical and contextually relevant.</p> <p><b>Specific Skills</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent interpersonal skills and a proven ability to multitask and work effectively under tight deadlines.</li> <li>• Proficiency in English is Mandatory.</li> <li>• Knowledge of local languages spoken within the target project areas will be considered a comparative advantage.</li> </ul>
<b>Availability</b>	35 working days between August and September, 2025
<b>ASF Contact and deadline</b>	<p><b>Application Process and Submission Requirements</b></p> <p>This section provides detailed instructions for interested consultants on how to apply for this evaluation assignment.</p> <p><b>Application Submission:</b> This call for applications is open to both national and international service providers. Applicants are required to submit their technical and financial proposals via email.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Submission Deadline:</b> Applications must be submitted by 5:00 p.m. on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2025</li> <li>• <b>Email Address:</b> All documents should be sent to <b><u>oug-job@asf.be</u></b>.</li> <li>• <b>Subject Line:</b> The email subject line must clearly state: "Consultancy – FATE Project Final Evaluation".</li> </ul> <p><b>Required Documents for Submission</b></p> <p>Interested consultants must submit the following documents as part of their application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cover Letter:</b> A concise cover letter expressing interest in the consultancy and highlighting relevant qualifications.</li> <li>• <b>Curriculum Vitae (CV):</b> A detailed CV demonstrating</li> </ul>

	<p>relevant skills and experience, including the names and contact details of at least two (2) professional references, preferably from organizations for which the consultant has conducted similar types of work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Indicative Budget:</b> A detailed indicative budget for consultant fees, a budget for proposed activities, the number of days allocated for each, and the daily rate. All fees should be inclusive of all applicable taxes as per the Income Tax Act, Cap 340 and quoted in Ugandan Shillings (UGX).</li> <li>• <b>Technical Proposal:</b> A comprehensive technical proposal outlining the consultant's understanding of the Terms of Reference, proposed methodology, work plan, and approach to addressing the evaluation questions.</li> <li>• <b>Sample of Similar Work:</b> A sample of similar evaluation work previously conducted by the consultant (optional).</li> <li>• <b>Declaration of Availability:</b> A clear declaration confirming availability to undertake the assignment between August and September 2025.</li> </ul>
--	---

## 1. Introduction

This document outlines the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the final evaluation of the **"From Access to Equality: Empowering women to access justice in Uganda" (FATE) project**. The project goal sought to empower women and girls to pursue justice in an environment that serves their needs.

This evaluation seeks to provide a comprehensive assessment of the project's performance, drawing on international best practices in development evaluation, and to generate critical insights for future programming. The evaluation will be implemented under the overall supervision of Avocats Sans Frontières (ASF).

### 1.1 Project Background

The "From Access To Equality: Empowering Women to Access Justice in Uganda" (FATE) project is a four-year project implemented from 2021 to 2025. It was a collaborative effort undertaken by a consortium of partners comprising Avocats Sans Frontières (ASF), Uganda Women's Network (UWONET), BarefootLaw (BFL),

and Penal Reform International (PRI). The project receives funding support from the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The geographical scope of the FATE project encompasses eleven districts across Uganda: Gulu, Lamwo, Hoima, Masindi, Napak, Moroto, Mbale, Soroti, Jinja, Namutumba, and Kamuli. The overarching goal of the project is to empower women and girls to pursue justice in an environment that serves their needs. To achieve this, the project defined the following specific objectives and expected results:

- Specific Objective 1: Women are in a position to demand justice.
  - Expected Result 1.1: Women are legally empowered to act.
- Specific Objective 2: Decision-makers mobilize to make women and girls' rights effective.
  - Expected Result 2.1: Legal aid and protection services are improved and tailored to respond to women and girls' access to justice needs.
  - Expected Result 2.2: Institutions are accountable for protecting and promoting women and girls' rights.

The multi-partner consortium structure of the FATE project, involving ASF, UWONET, BFL, and PRI, presented both a strategic advantage and a potential complexity for evaluation. This collaborative framework implies that the evaluation must not only assess the individual contributions of each partner but also critically examine the efficacy of the consortium model itself. This includes evaluating how effectively partners collaborated, leveraged their respective strengths, and navigated any coordination challenges. Such an assessment is crucial for deriving valuable lessons concerning the design and implementation of future multi-partner initiatives.

Furthermore, the project's explicit focus on "empowering women and girls" and enhancing "access to justice" directly aligns with broader global development agendas, particularly the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), specifically SDG 5 (Gender Equality) and SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions). While not a direct requirement of this ToR, acknowledging this broader alignment enhances the project's relevance and potential impact, demonstrating its contribution to wider development objectives for both the funding partner and ASF.

This project contributes directly to the Sustainable Development Goals 5 (Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls), 10 (Reduce inequality within and among countries) and 16 (Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for

sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels).

The project contributes to the implementation of the Lilongwe Declaration on accessing legal aid in criminal justice systems (2004) in so far as its first legal aid services are accessible for all, but specifically tailored to meet women's needs. The project also contributes to the implementation of the Bangkok rules on the treatment of women prisoners (2010).

**Table: FATE Project Overview**

<b>Feature</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	From Access to Equality: Empowering women to access justice in Uganda (FATE)
<b>Overall Goal</b>	To empower women and girls to pursue justice in an environment that serves their needs
<b>Specific Objectives</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Women are in a position to demand justice</li> <li>2. Decision-makers mobilize to make women and girls' rights effective</li> </ol>
<b>Expected Results</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Women are legally empowered to act</li> <li>2.1 Legal aid and protection services are improved and tailored to respond to women and girls' access to justice needs</li> <li>2.2 Institutions are accountable for protecting and promoting women and girls' rights</li> </ol>
<b>Consortium Partners</b>	Avocats Sans Frontières (ASF), Uganda Women's Network (UWONET), BarefootLaw (BFL), Penal Reform International (PRI)
<b>Funding Partner</b>	Kingdom of the Netherlands
<b>Project Duration</b>	4 years (2021 - 2025)
<b>Geographical Scope</b>	Gulu, Lamwo, Hoima, Masindi, Napak, Moroto, Mbale, Soroti, Jinja, Namutumba, Kamuli districts in Uganda

## **1.2 Overview of Consortium partners**

### **Avocats Sans Frontières (ASF)**

Avocats Sans Frontières (ASF) is an independent international nongovernmental organization established in Belgium in 1992. Its core mission is to promote the establishment of institutions and mechanisms that facilitate access to independent and impartial justice, thereby guaranteeing the protection of fundamental rights, including civil, political, economic, and social rights, as well as the right to a fair trial.

For over two decades, ASF has been actively engaged in implementing programs designed to improve access to justice for vulnerable populations, particularly in fragile states or contexts undergoing transition. Its operational presence spans various countries, including the Central African Republic, Niger, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Tunisia, Morocco, Kenya, and notably, Uganda. This extensive experience in complex and often politically sensitive justice environments underscores ASF's deep understanding of the systemic challenges inherent in such contexts. Consequently, an evaluation commissioned by ASF must extend beyond merely assessing project outputs; it must also examine the underlying systemic issues and the project's strategic engagement with or influence on these broader factors. This approach enriches the scope of "lessons learned" by incorporating strategic and political considerations relevant to the sustainability of justice sector reforms.

### **Penal Reform International (PRI)**

PRI has over 30 years' experience in criminal justice reform and has worked in Uganda since 1990. Ensuring gender sensitivity is a key component of their work. PRI has a significant part in the implementation of the Bangkok Rules for the treatment of women offenders and have over the last four years provided both technical and training support to law enforcement on the management of vulnerable offenders (women and children) in Uganda. PRI led the capacity building engagement with JLOS institutions, in order to foster positive institutional reform.

### **Barefoot Law (BFL)**

BFL is at the forefront of innovations in access to justice – making access to justice and law readily available to vulnerable communities. Through the innovative use of digital technologies, it empowers people to develop legal solutions to their problems. Drawing from a successful pilot implemented with ASF in Acholi, BFL developed digital legal aid services for women victims of GBVs. The digital services include a SMS and Interactive Voice Response (IVR) platform, which not only overcomes the barriers in physical reach to remote areas, but also solves language issues and allows women to access information in "safe spaces" that is outside the influence of men.

## **The Uganda Women's Network (UWONET)**

UWONET is an advocacy organization with a vast membership of 24 established National Women's Rights Organizations, and District Women's Networks in more than 80 districts across Uganda. Hinging on her substantive experience in GBV programming spanning 28 years, and nation-wide network of women organizations, UWONET worked across the project. UWONET's ongoing gender assessment of the barriers to women and girl's access to justice will strengthen the intervention in all its aspects. In particular, UWONET led provision of GBV shelters and essential services for survivors; institutional strengthening for effective CSO GBV response and management; and dialogues with cultural, community and religious leaders and adjudicators of informal justice systems for gender responsive ADR.

### **1.3 About the FATE Project**

#### **Context of the Evaluation**

This document serves as the Terms of Reference for the final evaluation of the FATE project, commissioned by Avocats Sans Frontières. The evaluation mission will be conducted in the specific geographical areas where the project was implemented and will assess the performance of the project and capture project achievements/results, challenges, and best practices. It offers a learning aspect for all stakeholders identifying key lessons learned, challenges, unintended effects and the flexibility of the programme to adapt and respond to the changes and sustainability of the project interventions.

As a final evaluation, its purpose extends beyond ongoing monitoring to encompass a summative judgment of the project's overall performance and achievements. This implies a strong emphasis on accountability for results, coupled with a forward-looking perspective aimed at informing future learning and strategic decisions for ASF and its partners. The evaluation is therefore expected to provide robust conclusions that can guide the design and implementation of subsequent interventions.

## **2. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation**

This section clearly articulates the rationale for conducting the evaluation and its intended outcomes.

### **2.1. Main Objective**

The main objective of this evaluation is to provide an overall assessment of the FATE project based on the internationally recognized OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The explicit use of these criteria signals a commitment to international best practices in development evaluation. This approach ensures that

the evaluation findings will be comparable to other evaluations utilizing these widely accepted standards, thereby enhancing their utility for accountability to the funding partner (the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands) and for organizational learning within ASF and its consortium partners.

## **2.2. Specific Objectives**

The evaluation seeks to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. Assess the performance of the project towards achieving the intended project objectives, results, and outcomes as agreed upon in the project document.
2. Assess the relevance and effectiveness of the FATE project interventions in enhancing women and girls' ability to pursue justice in an environment that serves their needs; towards achieving the project outcomes/results. What worked (or did not work) and why.
3. Identify and assess critical lessons learned, challenges, unintended effects of the project and draw recommendations for future programmes.
4. Assess whether the risks identified in the project were the most important and appropriate ones. Were the risk management strategies/responses that were adopted by the project adequate?
5. Assess the likely sustainability of the project, examining particularly from the beneficiaries' perspective, how much of the project's knowledge and practice transfer efforts has been learned, adopted, used and institutionalized by the beneficiaries and other stakeholders and partners.

The emphasis on "lessons learned to form recommendations for future programmes" highlights a significant learning agenda for ASF. This goes beyond mere accountability for past performance; it requires the evaluator to provide actionable, forward-looking insights that can directly inform strategic planning and the design of subsequent interventions in the access to justice sector, particularly those focused on women's empowerment. This necessitates a deeper analytical approach that not only reports on what was achieved but also explores why certain outcomes occurred, identifies transferable knowledge, and proposes concrete improvements for ASF, consortium partners and the funding partner, the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.



### 3. Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

This section forms the core of the Terms of Reference, detailing the specific areas of inquiry that the evaluation must address, structured around the OECD DAC criteria. These questions may be adjusted by the consultant in close cooperation with ASF and consortium partners.

#### 3.1. Guiding Principles for Application of OECD DAC Criteria

The OECD DAC criteria—relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability—provide a normative framework for determining the merit or worth of a development intervention, whether it be a policy, strategy, program, project, or activity. These criteria are not intended to be applied mechanistically; rather, their application should be thoughtful and contextualized.

**Principle One** dictates that the criteria should be applied thoughtfully to support high-quality, useful evaluation. This requires considering the specific context of the individual evaluation, the intervention being evaluated, and the stakeholders involved. The interpretation and analysis of the criteria should be informed by the specific evaluation questions and the intended use of the evaluation findings. For the FATE project, this means the evaluator must consider the unique socio-cultural and political landscape of Uganda, especially concerning women's access to justice, rather than employing a generic template. This necessitates a nuanced interpretation of findings, often requiring qualitative data to capture the complexities of local power dynamics, cultural norms, and specific barriers faced by women.

**Principle Two** stipulates that the use of the criteria depends on the purpose of the evaluation. They should be covered according to the needs of relevant stakeholders and the specific context of the evaluation. This reinforces the need for a flexible yet rigorous approach, ensuring that the evaluation remains pertinent to the partners' strategic learning and accountability needs.

#### 3.2. Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right things?

**Definition:** Relevance assesses the extent to which the intervention's objectives and design respond to the needs, policies, and priorities of beneficiaries, global frameworks, national contexts, and partner institutions, and whether this alignment continues to hold true if circumstances change.

**Importance:** Evaluating relevance helps stakeholders understand if an intervention is appropriately designed and executed to address the identified problems. It assesses how clearly an intervention's goals and implementation align with

beneficiary and stakeholder needs and the underlying priorities of the intervention. Relevance is often considered a prerequisite for achieving other evaluation criteria, as a project that is not relevant to actual needs is unlikely to be effective or have a lasting impact. This implies a causal link: if the foundation of a project (its relevance) is weak, then even efficient implementation may not lead to desired outcomes or sustainable benefits. Therefore, a rigorous assessment of the initial problem analysis and the project's ongoing adaptation to women's evolving justice needs is fundamental to the entire evaluation.

**Key Challenges:** A significant challenge in evaluating relevance is navigating the multiple, potentially competing priorities and needs among various national and international stakeholders.

### **Key Evaluation Questions for FATE:**

- To what extent were the FATE project's objectives and design aligned with the identified needs and priorities of women and girls in Uganda concerning access to justice?
- How well did the project's design align with national policies and legal frameworks related to gender equality, human rights, and access to justice in Uganda?
- Did the project adequately respond to the evolving context and needs of women and girls throughout its implementation (2021-2025), particularly in the target districts?
- To what extent did the project's approach to "legal empowerment" and "improving legal aid and protection services" remain pertinent and valuable to the target beneficiaries?
- How well did the project address the specific barriers (e.g., cultural, economic, social, security-related) that women and girls face in accessing justice in Uganda?

### **3.3. Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?**

**Definition:** Coherence evaluates the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions within a country, sector, or institution. It examines the consistency and synergistic qualities of an intervention, checking for harmonization, avoidance of duplication, and contradictions with other actions in the same context.

**Importance:** Coherence ensures that interventions are not isolated efforts but are effectively integrated into the broader developmental fabric. This integration can maximize synergies and prevent fragmented or counterproductive efforts.

### **Key Evaluation Questions for FATE:**

- To what extent was the FATE project internally coherent, ensuring consistency and synergy among the objectives, expected results, and activities implemented by the consortium partners (ASF, UWONET, BFL, PRI)? The multi-partner consortium structure necessitates an examination of how these four organizations coordinated their efforts to achieve a unified and synergistic approach, rather than operating in silos.

This aspect directly influences the project's overall efficiency and effectiveness.

- How well did the FATE project complement or align with other national, regional, or international initiatives and policies aimed at promoting access to justice and gender equality in Uganda?
- Did the project effectively avoid duplication of efforts with other actors working in the same geographical areas or thematic sectors, and where applicable, did it establish effective partnerships?
- Were there any unintended negative interactions or contradictions between the FATE project and other interventions or policies in Uganda?

### **3.4. Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?**

**Definition:** Effectiveness measures the extent to which an intervention's objectives have been achieved, taking into consideration its outputs and outcomes. This criterion also encompasses the timeliness of implementation and the preparedness of the intervention to meet its objectives. A significant aspect of the revised definition includes "differential results across groups," encouraging a deeper investigation of exclusion and power dynamics.

**Importance:** Assessing effectiveness is crucial for determining the overall success of an intervention in meeting its stated goals.

#### **Key Evaluation Questions for FATE:**

- To what extent has the FATE project achieved its overall goal of empowering women and girls to pursue justice in an environment that serves their needs?
- What progress has been made towards achieving Specific Objective 1: "Women are in a position to demand justice," and Expected Result 1.1: "Women are legally empowered to act"?
- What progress has been made towards achieving Specific Objective 2: "Decision-makers mobilize to make women and girls' rights effective," and Expected Results 2.1 ("Legal aid and protection services are improved and tailored to respond to women and girls' access to justice needs") and 2.2

("Institutions are accountable for protecting and promoting women and girls' rights")?

- Were the project activities implemented in a timely manner, and was the project sufficiently prepared and equipped to meet its objectives?
- What were the differential results of the project across various groups of women and girls (e.g., by age, socio-economic status, geographical location, specific vulnerabilities)? Were there any unintended negative consequences for specific groups? <sup>2</sup> For a gender-focused project like FATE, this is paramount; the evaluation must move beyond aggregate success rates to understand who benefited, how, and why, and critically, who might have been left behind or negatively affected, necessitating disaggregated data and a nuanced analysis of equity.
- What were the enabling factors and constraints that influenced the project's effectiveness in achieving its objectives?

### **3.5. Efficiency: How well are resources being used?**

**Definition:** Efficiency examines the degree to which an intervention delivers results in a cost-effective and timely manner. It involves comparing the outputs (both qualitative and quantitative) to the inputs used and assessing whether the most efficient processes were employed to achieve the desired outcomes, often by comparing different approaches.

**Considerations:** The assessment of efficiency extends beyond mere financial accounting to include the influence of political factors, the origin of inputs (e.g., local versus imported goods), and a comprehensive evaluation of costs across sectors, encompassing local and international inputs, transportation expenses, and staff costs. In some cases, expertise in economics or accounting may be required for a proper evaluation of efficiency. For the FATE project, this implies assessing whether strategic choices, such as reliance on local versus international staff or materials, and engagement with local government structures, contributed to or hindered efficiency, rather than solely focusing on budget adherence. Utilizing local resources and expertise, for instance, can significantly enhance efficiency by reducing overheads, building local capacity, and ensuring cultural appropriateness, which can lead to better long-term outcomes.

#### **Key Evaluation Questions for FATE:**

- To what extent were the project's resources (financial, human, material) utilized economically and efficiently to achieve the stated objectives and results?
- Could the same results have been achieved with fewer resources, or could greater results have been achieved with the same resources?

- Were project activities implemented in a cost-effective and timely manner?
- What factors, including political considerations or procurement practices (e.g., local sourcing versus imports), influenced the project's efficiency?
- How effectively did the consortium manage financial resources across partners?

### **3.6. Impact: What difference does the intervention make?**

**Definition:** Impact refers to all effects in the longer term. It examines the ultimate significance of an intervention, including its value to those affected. This includes assessing positive and negative, direct and indirect effects on beneficiaries, impacts on institutional capacity within the host country, and broader indirect or second-round effects.

**Importance:** There is a growing emphasis on evaluating the actual impacts of projects, rather than solely focusing on how well they achieved their immediate goals.

**Key Challenges:** Designing feasible data collection strategies for impact, accurately identifying beneficiaries, and collecting data at various stages of the project or program cycle can be challenging. Furthermore, for projects addressing sensitive issues such as women's access to justice, unintended negative impacts (e.g., increased risk for beneficiaries, backlash from traditional authorities) are a real possibility and must be actively sought out and analyzed. Complex social interventions often have ripple effects beyond their immediate objectives, requiring evaluators to proactively investigate these intricate, sometimes hidden, outcomes to provide a complete picture of the project's influence.

#### **Key Evaluation Questions for FATE:**

- What significant positive and negative changes (intended and unintended) has the FATE project contributed to in the lives of women and girls regarding their access to justice and empowerment?
- To what extent has the project influenced the institutional capacity of justice actors (e.g., police, judiciary, legal aid providers, local government) to protect and promote women and girls' rights?
- What broader, indirect, or second-round effects has the project had on the justice sector or gender equality landscape in Uganda?
- How has the project contributed to changes in perceptions, attitudes, or behaviors regarding women's access to justice within communities and institutions?

- Are there any indications of systemic changes in the justice environment that can be attributed, even partially, to the FATE project?

### **3.7. Sustainability: Will the benefits last?**

**Definition:** Sustainability focuses on the durability of benefits derived from an intervention. It assesses the likelihood that the positive changes and benefits will continue after the major development assistance has concluded.

**Importance:** Sustainability is crucial for ensuring the long-term positive effects of development interventions.

#### **Key Evaluation Questions for FATE:**

- To what extent are the benefits and positive changes achieved by the FATE project likely to continue after the project's completion?
- What is the level of ownership and commitment from local stakeholders, including government institutions, civil society organizations, and communities, to sustain the project's results and activities? Sustainability is not merely about financial viability but also about institutional capacity and local ownership. For FATE, this means assessing whether the "empowerment" of women and the "accountability" of institutions have been truly internalized and are self-sustaining, rather than dependent on external project funding or personnel.
- Are there adequate financial, institutional, and technical capacities within partner organizations and local structures to maintain the services and empowerment initiatives initiated by the project?
- How resilient are the changes contributed to by the project in the face of emerging social, economic, or political changes in Uganda?
- What strategies were put in place by the project to ensure the long-term sustainability of results, and how effective were they?

### **3.8. Lessons Learned and Recommendations**

**Importance:** The identification of "lessons learned" is explicitly requested for this evaluation and represents a critical component for informing future programming. This necessitates a deep dive into why certain outcomes occurred, beyond just what happened. This requires a qualitative and analytical approach to identify causal pathways, enabling factors, and barriers, which is crucial for genuine organizational learning.

#### **Key Evaluation Questions for FATE:**

- What were the key good practices and successful approaches employed by the FATE project that could be replicated or scaled up in future access to justice or women's empowerment initiatives?
- What significant challenges were encountered during the project implementation, and how were they addressed (or not addressed)? What can be learned from these challenges?
- What were the main enabling and constraining factors (e.g., contextual, political, institutional, partner dynamics) that influenced the project's performance across all OECD DAC criteria?
- Based on the findings, what concrete, actionable recommendations can be provided for ASF and its partners to improve the design, implementation, and sustainability of future programs in the access to justice sector in Uganda and beyond?
- What specific recommendations can be made regarding the consortium model for future projects?

## **4. Methodology and Approach**

This section outlines the expected methodological framework for the evaluation, emphasizing a collaborative and robust approach.

### **4.1. Overall Approach**

The evaluation will follow a mixed-method approach, including the following:

- a) Elaboration of the methodology for the evaluation presented in an inception report.
- b) Desk review of all relevant program documentation, such as project document, mid-term review, annual reports, baseline, midline and endline reports, etc.
- c) Undertake fieldwork in project intervention areas, interviews with key local stakeholders, such as (in)direct beneficiaries, (local) government, and project staff and consortium and implementing partners.
- d) Stakeholder consultations at local and national level.
- e) Qualitative and quantitative analysis based on results of the evaluation activities, including fieldwork in the targeted areas. Specific attention needs to be given to probing beyond 'expected answers' to get to underlying opinions.
- f) Qualitative analysis to enable the formulation of an opinion on the impact of the project.

- g) Presentation of the key findings to the project and other relevant stakeholders and later EKN.
- h) Preparation of a draft evaluation report for review by the FATE consortium, containing the mission's main findings and recommendations.
- i) Elaboration of the final report, including an executive summary, and related annexes.
- j) Any subsequent adjustments required by the FATE consortium and EKN, as needed for final approval of the reports.

The evaluators will design and decide on the program of the evaluation and select the project consortium and implementing partners, stakeholders, beneficiaries, project staff, intervention areas, government agencies etc to be visited/interviewed. ASF will offer support based on the developed program, if required.

The final methodology will be determined jointly by ASF and the selected consultancy team during the inception phase. While this indicates a collaborative spirit, it also places a significant responsibility on the consultant to propose a robust initial methodology in their technical proposal. This proposal should demonstrate a clear understanding of the project's complexities, the specific challenges of data collection in the target districts, and the nuances inherent in evaluating gender and justice programs.

## **4.2. Inception Phase**

At the initial phase of the assignment, ASF and the consortium partners, and the selected consultant will convene for an inception meeting. The primary purposes of this meeting are to validate the proposed schedule and work plan, identify areas where support from ASF and partners will be required, finalize the detailed methodology, and agree on a comprehensive list of project documents available and necessary for the successful execution of the evaluation.

Following this meeting, the consultant is required to submit a comprehensive inception report. This report serves as the blueprint for the entire evaluation and must outline the following key elements:

- The selected methodology and a clear justification for its choice in relation to the specific evaluation mission and the FATE project's context.
- A detailed list of key documents to be reviewed for the evaluation, including project proposals, monitoring reports, and other relevant programmatic documents.
- The specific tools designed for data collection (e.g., survey questionnaires, interview guides, focus group discussion protocols).



- The criteria for selecting respondents and a clear explanation for their selection, ensuring representation across various stakeholder groups.
- The method for data analysis, detailing how quantitative and qualitative data will be processed and triangulated to answer the evaluation questions.
- A detailed work plan for the entire evaluation, including specific activities, timelines, and responsibilities.

The detailed requirements for the inception report underscore ASF's commitment to a well-planned and transparent evaluation process. This report functions as a critical checkpoint, ensuring complete alignment between the consultant's proposed approach and ASF's expectations before significant fieldwork commences.

### **4.3. Data Collection**

The consortium partners as well as the implementing partners of the FATE project are committed to making themselves available throughout the duration of the mission to assist the consultant in collecting information relevant to the evaluation.

The consultant will have access to a range of programmatic documents, including the original Terms of Reference for the project, annual and other project reports, and data collected as part of the project's monitoring and evaluation mechanism.

In addition to document review, the consultant will be expected to conduct consultations with a diverse range of stakeholders. These include consortium and implementing partners, representatives of civil society organizations, community-based organizations, local government officials, and other community representatives actively involved in the project areas.

A critical aspect of the data collection phase involves addressing potential data gaps. In instances where relevant data is absent, the consultant is expected to proactively identify alternative sources of verification and recommend concrete measures to ASF for making such data available.<sup>1</sup> This explicit instruction highlights a potential challenge with data availability or quality and requires the consultant to be resourceful and proactive in identifying alternative data sources or methods, rather than simply stating limitations.

### **4.4. Data Analysis**

The inception report will detail the specific methods for data analysis. The analytical approach must be robust enough to thoroughly address all OECD DAC criteria, including the inherent nuances of gender dynamics and access to justice issues within the Ugandan context. This requires a systematic approach to triangulate findings from various data sources to ensure validity and reliability of conclusions.

## 5. Deliverables and Reporting Requirements

This section specifies the tangible outputs expected from the external consultant throughout the evaluation process.

### 5.1. List of Expected Deliverables

ASF expects the following deliverables from the selected consultant:

- **Inception Report:** A comprehensive report detailing the literature review, refined methodology, data collection tools, and a revised timeline for the evaluation.
- **All Data:** Submission of all raw and processed data collected during the evaluation, including copies of the final datasets and hard copies of all data collection instruments used. The requirement to submit all data underscores ASF's commitment to data transparency, ownership, and the potential for future internal analysis or verification.
- **Draft Evaluation Report:** A preliminary version of the evaluation report submitted for review and feedback by ASF and its consortium partners.
- **Final Evaluation Report:** The conclusive evaluation report, incorporating feedback from ASF and partners, presenting the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
- **Presentation of Findings:** A presentation summarizing the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations to ASF and its partners.

All deliverables related to the evaluation mission must be handed over and finalized before September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

**Table: Evaluation Deliverables and Timeline**

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Approximate Working Days</b>	<b>Due Date (or Relative Timeline)</b>
Inception Report	Detailing literature review, methodology, tools, and timeline	To be proposed by consultant	Within first 7-10 working days of assignment

Data Submission	Copies of final datasets and hard copies of collection instruments	Integrated throughout data collection	Upon completion of fieldwork
Draft Evaluation Report	For review by ASF and partners	To be proposed by consultant	By 31 <sup>st</sup> August, 2025
Final Evaluation Report	Incorporating feedback	To be proposed by consultant	Before 12 <sup>th</sup> September, 2025
Presentation of Findings	To ASF and partners	To be proposed by consultant	Before 12 <sup>th</sup> September, 2025

## 5.2. Reporting Language and Format

All reports and presentations must be prepared and submitted in English. The final evaluation report should be concise, clear, and well-structured, adhering to professional reporting standards typically observed in international development evaluations.

## 6. Timeline and budget

The entire evaluation assignment is expected to span a period of 35 working days. This work is to be conducted between August and September 2025. All deliverables must be finalized and submitted before September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

At least 65% of the required persons-days will be allocated for fieldwork. The budget for the whole assignment (inclusive of consultant fees, all proposed activity fees and any other logistical fees related to the assignment) will range between 28,000 and 40,000 euros (Including VAT if applicable).

## 7. Conditions of the Mission

Payment for the consultancy services shall be made based on the successful completion and acceptance of deliverables, in accordance with ASF's established consultancy rates which will inform the final agreement.