

Costed Evaluation Plan UGANDA

Programme Cycle:	Ninth Country Programme Document (2021-2025)					
Evidence utilized in the design of the costed plan	<p>The Costed Plan was informed by the following evidence, conducted and implemented during the previous Country Programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eighth Country Programme (2016 – 2020) Baseline assessment • Country Programme 2016-2020 Evaluation • Evaluation of the National Development Plan II • Baseline Evaluation of Better Life for Girls Project • Better Life for Girls (BL4G) Project Evaluation • Evaluation. of Joint Programme on Population (JPP) (2015) • End line evaluation of Youth Enterprise Model (YEM) project • JPGBV – bridging phase (2014 – 2015) and End line Evaluation (2017) • Mid Term Review of the Uganda Health Sector Development Plan (2016-2020) • Uganda UNDAF 2016 – 2020 Mid-term evaluation • Evaluation of the Uganda National Development Plan II • Uganda Common Country Analysis 					
CP areas	Outcomes 1 and 4.					
Evaluations						
Exercise title and type	Purpose of the Exercise	Start and end date (Month, Year)	Estimated Cost \$ ¹	Source of Funding	Key partners when conducting the exercise	Is it a joint exercise ?
Country Programme 2021-2025 Evaluation	Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the CP, as well as UNFPA's added value and visibility in the country.	July - Sep 2024	USD 110,000	Regular resources	Government, NGOs, academic institutions, UN agencies	No
UNSDCF 2021-2025 evaluation	To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the UNSDCF, Assess how the joint and comprehensive initiatives contribute to achieving SDGs and NDPIII in the country.	July - Sept 2024	USD 60,000	Non-regular resources	Other UN Agencies, Government, NGOs, academic institutions	Yes, with gov't and the UN System
WAY Project (2018 – 2022) Endline Evaluation	Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the WAY programme	July - Sept 2022	USD 50,000	Non-regular resources	Government, NGOs, UN agencies	No
UK-RISE Project (2017 – 2022) Evaluation	Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of results of the RISE project	July - Sept 2022	USD 30,000	Non-regular resources	Government, NGOs, UN agencies	No

¹ The budget of the evaluation plan should be commensurate to the overall budget of the country programme

JPGBV (2019 – 2024) Mid-term evaluation	Assessment of implementation rate, achievement of intermediate results, efficiency gains, challenges, lessons learned) to improve programme implementation, and making necessary course corrections	Jan – May 2022	USD 80000	Non-regular resources	Government, NGOs, UN agencies	Yes, with gov't and the UN System
JPGBV (2019 – 2024) Endline evaluation	Assess progress implementation of interventions, and achievement of planned objectives. Identify challenges, lessons and good practices for scaling up	July – Sept 2024	USD 96,232	Non-regular resources	Government, NGOs, UN agencies	Yes, with gov't and the UN System
Netherlands (2019 – 2023) Evaluation	Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the Netherlands project	July – Sept 2023	USD 50,000	Non-regular resources	Government, NGOs, UN agencies	No
ADA (2020 – 2021) Evaluation	Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the ADA project	July - Sept 2021	USD 38,000	Non-regular resources	Government and UNFPA	No

Evaluative activities (not evaluations)

<p>Country Programme 2021-2025 Baseline survey</p>	<p>Establish baseline data for specific programme outcomes and outputs to be used as benchmarks to enable the government and UNFPA measure the contribution of the 9th Country Programme in improving the quality of life of Ugandans</p>	<p>July – Sept 2021</p>	<p>USD 70,000</p>	<p>Regular resources</p>	<p>Government, NGOs, academic institutions, UN agencies</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Internal Capacity development for on evaluation</p>	<p>Training of CO personnel and implementing partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Results-based management. ▪ Planning and programming for evidence-based results <p>Theory of change, logical framework and indicators</p> </p>	<p>Annually between 2021-2025</p>	<p>USD 2500</p>	<p>Regular and non-regular resources</p>	<p>UNFPA</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>South to South Triangular Cooperation</p>	<p>Development Evaluation</p>	<p>July 2024</p>	<p>USD 20000</p>	<p>Regular resources</p>	<p>UNFPA, NGOs</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>WAY Project (2018 – 2022) Mid-term review</p>	<p>Independent assessment of the WAY programme performance (implementation rate, achievement of intermediate results, efficiency measures, challenges, lessons learned) from 2018-2020 to improve programme implementation, and making necessary course corrections</p>	<p>Jun - Dec 2020</p>	<p>USD 50,000</p>	<p>Non-regular resources</p>	<p>Other UN Agencies, Government, NGOs, academic institutions</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>JPGBV (2019 – 2024) Baseline evaluation</p>	<p>Establish reference points to assess progress towards achieving intended JP GBV results at national level and in districts of implementation; as well as carry an assessment of knowledge, attitudes and practices of GBV and SRHR (services, policies, norms)</p>	<p>May – Nov 2020</p>	<p>USD 63,768</p>	<p>Non-regular resources</p>	<p>Government, NGOs, UN agencies</p>	<p>Yes, with gov't and the UN System</p>
<p>Netherlands (2019 – 2023) Baseline survey</p>	<p>Establish reference points to assess progress towards achieving intended project results; assess knowledge, attitudes and practices of GBV and SRHR; resource and budget tracking for</p>	<p>Jun 2020 – Dec 2020</p>	<p>USD 50,000</p>	<p>Non-regular resources</p>	<p>Government, NGOs, UN agencies</p>	<p>No</p>

	SRH/GBV/HIV services; partner mapping					
ADA (2020 – 2021) Baseline survey	Establish reference points for missing indicator values to assess progress towards achieving intended project results	Jun - Sept 2020	USD 20,000	Non-regular resources	Government and UNFPA	No

A. Template for the technical review of the costed evaluation plan by the Evaluation Office

The table below contains the format to be utilized by the Evaluation Office for the technical review of costed evaluation plans.

General comments on the evaluation plan:	
Name of Country:	
Programme cycle:	
Region:	
Criteria	Assessment
Appropriateness of format including: Evaluation title, purpose of evaluation, timeline including start and end date, estimated cost, source of funding, key evaluation partners	
Articulation with evidence from other evaluations or exercises to prepare the plan and evidence of mapping of information needs to be addressed by plan	
Articulation of purpose of the proposed evaluations	
Number and nature of evaluations foreseen taking into consideration the budget of CPD and programmatic portfolio	
Adequacy of estimated cost of each evaluation	
Adequacy of expected duration of each evaluation	
Timeliness of the exercises to provide input to the next CPD design and programming	