

Arthur van Schendelstraat 696
3511 MJ Utrecht
P.O. Box 9022
3506 GA Utrecht
The Netherlands

+31(0)30 231 34 31
office@rutgers.nl
www.rutgers.international
www.rutgers.nl

BIC ABNA NL 2A
IBAN NL18 ABNA 0496 3238 22

Utrecht, July 2016

© Consortium of the GUSO programme, 2016

Terms of Reference Researching programme impact and conducting an evaluation For the Get Up Speak Out (GUSO) programme

Index

Introduction	3
1 Evaluation of outcomes and impact through a baseline, mid-term and end-line study to reveal programme results	4
2 Qualitative evaluation of the strategies and operations of the programme, for learning purposes	5
3 Intended audience for the evaluation	6
4 Research issues and key questions	7
5 Roles and responsibilities, timeline and estimated costs	11
Annex 1 Short description of the programme	13
Annex 2 Definitions	14
Annex 3 Overview of the joint indicators	15
Annex 4 Available background information for the evaluation team, which can be provided upon request	17

Introduction

Based on these Terms of Reference, we would like to invite proposals from researchers/evaluators to evaluate the GUSO programme. Deadline for submission: 29 August 2016.

Despite the progress made in improving sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) since the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD, 1994), young people are still vulnerable to poor SRHR outcomes. Many young people lack access to comprehensive SRHR information, education and services, which severely limits their ability to make informed decisions, protect their health and stand up for their rights. With over 1.8 billion young people (aged 10-25) living in the world today, addressing their sexual and reproductive health and well-being makes a significant contribution to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

In the Get Up Speak Out programme (2016-2020), a consortium works towards a society where all young people, especially girls and young women, are empowered to realise their SRHR in societies with a positive attitude towards young people's sexuality. The consortium consists of six Dutch/UK organisations (CHOICE, dance4life, IPPF, Rutgers (lead agency), Simavi and STOP AIDS NOW!), and about 40 partner organisations. The GUSO programme is implemented in two Asian countries (Indonesia and Pakistan) and five African countries (Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi and Uganda) by in-country alliances. The programme is funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.

The GUSO programme builds on the earlier Access, Services and Knowledge (ASK) and Unite for Body Rights (UFBR) programmes, and aims to: 1) strengthen existing in-country SRHR Alliances; 2) empower young people to voice their rights; 3) increase access to and utilisation of SRHR information/education; 4) increase access to and utilisation of sexual and reproductive health (SRH) services; and 5) improve/create a supportive environment for SRHR.

GUSO's Theory of Change is based on the effectiveness of a multicomponent approach: to be most effective in achieving results, all components (demand, supply, and an enabling environment) need to be addressed. Building the capacity of the alliances and (youth) civil society is part and parcel of this work. Key principles to which the programme adheres include meaningful youth participation, gender-transformative approaches and positive rights-based approaches.

This evaluation is commissioned by the Dutch/UK consortium implementing the GUSO programme, with Rutgers as the lead agency. The more detailed programme description is attached in Annex 1.

Overall purpose of the assignment

This assignment concerns an effect and process evaluation of the five-year GUSO programme, to provide evidence on and insights into the impact of the GUSO programme on the lives of young people. It concerns measuring changes relating to the long-term objective and intermediate outcomes in the seven GUSO countries, over a period of five years. The consortium calls for an external, independent party to: 1) evaluate (progress towards) programme outcomes and long-term objective; 2) understand what processes have led to these results, including enabling factors and barriers; 3) propose feasible recommendations to inform future programme design.

In summary, the assignment consists of two interrelated but different components that will take place during the entire programme period.

1. Measuring performance on a number of preselected outcome and impact indicators¹² through a baseline, mid-term and end-line study to reveal programme results. In two countries, we expect data to be collected in non-GUSO-project sites as well, to serve as a comparison group to determine whether changes can be attributed to the GUSO programme.
2. Evaluation of the strategies and operations of the programme for learning purposes.

¹ Annex 2 includes an overview of the PMEL definitions used by the consortium.

² Annex 3 provides an overview of which indicators will be measured by the research team

1 Evaluation of outcomes and impact through a baseline, mid-term and end-line study to reveal programme results

A) Baseline, mid-term and endline study

Background: The GUSO country programmes have country-specific Theories of Changes, including country-specific indicator frameworks. As the country-specific programmes have been developed within the overall GUSO programme framework, they have many aspects in common. The GUSO Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (PMEL) working group has developed a joint indicator framework, consisting of output, outcome and process indicators, and indicators for the long-term objective. These indicators are presented in Annex 2. The joint indicators will be monitored and evaluated using similar methodologies in the seven countries.

Scope: Through this call for proposals, the GUSO consortium intends to outsource the evaluation of a set of outcome and impact indicators, indicated with red in the indicator framework³ (see Annex 3), to an independent research entity. These indicators will be measured at baseline, mid-term, and towards the end of the programme, in order to demonstrate changes. The indicators will be measured in all seven countries, and in each country in two programme areas. The consortium envisions data for the different indicators to be measured by means of one tool (survey), supplemented with additional methods for triangulation.

Timeline: The baseline measurement, including the baseline report, should be finalised before 23 December 2016. The mid-term measurement is planned in Q1 of 2018, and the end-line measurement is planned in Q1/Q2 of 2020. The final evaluation report should be submitted before 15 June 2020.

Expected outputs: The consortium expects methodologically sound evidence on the impact of the GUSO programme on the lives of young people. The research will demonstrate results by comparing baseline, mid-term and end-line scores, both at outcome level and for the long-term objective.

B) Comparative study in two countries to strengthen evidence on the effectiveness of the programme's interventions

Background: In addition to measuring the long-term objectives and outcome indicators, similar data collection in non-GUSO-project sites in two countries is expected to provide evidence on the actual and relative contribution of the programme to the results demonstrated in the performance study. This will strengthen the evidence base on the effectiveness of the programme's interventions, and contribute to sector-wide evidence on the results of SRHR programming.

Scope: The study will be executed in two countries, in which comparison groups will be added to the baseline, mid-term and end-line study.

Timeline: similar to the baseline, mid-term and end-line studies.

Expected output: The consortium expects a scientifically sound study in two countries, in which the contribution of the programme's interventions to the changes demonstrated will be validated. The consortium wants to determine whether there has been a change in the lives of young people and to what extent this change can be attributed to the GUSO programme's interventions, and wants to obtain insights into which interventions reach and affect young people the most.

³ The consortium will monitor the other indicators itself, which are more qualitative and process-oriented.

2 Qualitative evaluation of the strategies and operations of the programme, for learning purposes

Background: At the end of the programme, the external research entity will evaluate the GUSO programme to provide insights into the underlying processes that have led to achieving the results. Compared to the other components, this part of the study has a more qualitative and process-oriented character. Through participatory evaluation methodologies, the research team will involve the GUSO country alliance to reflect on the strategies and operations of the programme and the underlying Theory of Change, and propose feasible recommendations for future programming. The evaluation shall focus on the programme's relevance, sustainability and scalability, impact, effectiveness and efficiency. It will provide the consortium with insights into the accuracy of the Theory of Change.

Scope: Data collection for the evaluation will take place in a selected number of countries. In addition, operational research data and the programme's PMEL data will serve as input. It seems most logical to select the countries in which the two quasi-experimental studies are executed, but the selection can be influenced by other factors as well. The selection will be made in consultation with the country alliances and might be decided on at a later stage.

Timeline: After the end-line study has been completed, in order to be able to include the findings in the evaluation. The final report should be finalised before July 2020.

Expected outcome: The evaluation component of the research should provide the consortium with an overview of lessons learned, recommendations, and insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the programme concerning impact, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability.

3 Intended audience for the evaluation

The findings will serve as input for different audiences:

- Members and partners of the consortium. The findings will be used by consortium members in the Netherlands/United Kingdom and in the programme countries to steer and adapt, and to identify successful strategies and lessons learned. Insights from the baseline and mid-term measurements will provide insights into which approaches need to be started, continued, revised or stopped for which target groups.
- The findings will be shared with important stakeholders in the programme countries and primary and secondary beneficiaries, especially young people, to ensure downward accountability and for learning, inspiration and motivation.
- The findings will be shared with international knowledge platforms for SRHR, to contribute to global learning and innovation concerning best practices, scalable interventions, and lessons learned.
- Furthermore, the evaluation report will be shared with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Dutch development sector, and the international SRHR field, and it will be published on the websites of the consortium members. After the evaluation report has become available, the country alliances and the consortium will use the findings for a variety of communication purposes.

4 Key questions, deliverables and criteria

The table below provides an overview of the main research questions.

Main question	Rationale - The consortium would like to understand the following:	Evaluators are asked to propose specific approaches; however, the consortium envisions the following:
Component 1: Monitoring performance on a number of preselected outcome and long-term indicators through a baseline, mid-term and end-line study, to reveal programme results		
What is the impact of the programme on the lives of the beneficiaries?	How has the SRHR of young people in GUSO programme areas improved concerning empowerment, gender equality, self-esteem and sexual health? How have conditions improved to make these changes possible (empowered young people/SRHR education/SRH services/enabling environment for SRHR)? (measuring the selected outcome indicators).	Measuring baseline, mid-term, and end-line values of the selected indicators. A survey at the level of final beneficiaries, measuring changes at outcomes and impact level in seven countries, in two areas per country. The GUSO consortium would like to build on (parts of) the recently developed GEAS ⁴ framework for measuring young people's SRHR.
Quasi-experimental study in two countries, to strengthen the evidence on the effectiveness of the programme's interventions		
Can changes measured at the level of beneficiaries be attributed to the GUSO programme?	Would the changes among beneficiaries also have occurred without the programme, or can they be attributed to the GUSO interventions? Which GUSO interventions have been most beneficial to young people?	Inclusion of a comparison group in the baseline, mid-term, and end-line studies in two countries.
Component 2: Evaluation of the strategies and operations of the programme, for learning purposes		
Has the GUSO programme achieved the desired results? Which strategies of the GUSO programme were effective, efficient and sustainable, and how relevant is the programme to beneficiaries?	Which strategies of the GUSO programme were effective, sustainable and scalable, and why? How successful has the programme been in including programmatic principles, particularly meaningful youth participation, gender-transformative approaches, the multicomponent approach and the rights-based approach (including inclusiveness)? How relevant is the GUSO programme according to the final beneficiaries?	Participatory evaluation approach in a selected number of GUSO countries. For the evaluation, the findings of the external party and the GUSO country alliances (PMEL data and operational research data) will be used. The country-specific Theory of Change of the GUSO country programme should be taken as a point of departure to assess strategies, assumptions, and envisioned change. Qualitative methodologies can provide stronger insights into the contribution of the programme towards results, and the processes enabling this.

Methodology and approach

We request the applicant to include a description of the methodologies for each component in the proposal, taking into account the following:

- For efficiency reasons (time and budget) we are considering the possibility of measuring the different indicators with one tool, a survey. Using mixed methods to triangulate data, and strengthening quantitative data with qualitative data, would be considered an asset. The research team should take into account that the country alliances themselves gather qualitative data as part of their country-specific PMEL framework; these data are available to the research team.
- Inclusiveness, meaningful youth participation, and gender equality are key principles in the GUSO programme, and should be reflected in the approaches, methodologies and reporting.
- The GUSO evaluation working group will be involved in the process of research tool development on behalf of the consortium, to ensure that the tools are aligned with the programme interventions and that research data will inform the indicators.

⁴ Global Early Adolescence study. Tools developed by John Hopkins University.

- The country alliances are co-commissioners of the assignment, and should be included in the process of making the research country-specific (for example selecting areas, reflecting on questions, and reviewing the translations of the tools into local languages).
- A number of young informants will be illiterate, or not very proficient in reading, writing, or filling in questionnaires. The consortium feels that the use of up-to-date data collection methodologies can overcome these barriers, diminish errors in data collection and data entry, and is time-efficient.
- Young people's SRHR is a sensitive topic. The research team should include their experience in working with this group and their ethical considerations and approach in their application. The applicant should state any ethical issues that might arise during or as a result of the (evaluation) research and suggest a process for mitigating them.

In addition to the description of methodologies, the applicant is requested to take into account the following instructions:

1. The proposed methodologies should be embedded in a clear and substantial framework for analysis.
2. The applicant is requested to propose the general methodological design for the field studies that will be specified in the inception reports (see paragraph on inception reports below). The applicant is welcome to include other research methodologies, or propose alternative methods, in addition to the methods mentioned above. These should be mentioned in the proposal.
3. The consortium has not decided on the selection of the countries for the comparison study and the evaluation study. The aim is to select one Asian country and one African country, but practical (need for ethical clearance) and external issues (safety, availability of visa) will influence the decision. The applicant is requested to describe a general process for ethical clearance in the proposal, which can be elaborated upon in the inception report (including local ethical review boards).
4. The PMEL frameworks include several components (regular monitoring, evaluation, operational research, reflection on and adaptation of programming, linking and learning, reporting and communication). The implementation of specific components will be carried out by country alliances, the consortium members or the research team, each party making its own specific contribution (see annex 3 which indicators will be measured by the research team). The consortium finds it very important to regularly discuss progress and findings with the external party for purposes of fine-tuning, communication and keeping up-to-date. Furthermore, the consortium thinks cooperation during the research process offers added value to both the research party and the country alliances. Based on the research findings, the external party is expected to play an advisory role in follow-up processes and advising country alliances about (further) specifying questions in research and monitoring. The external party is also expected to present the data and play a role in reflection processes. The applicant is requested to include a description of how they will put these forms of cooperation into practice.

Process and deliverables

The research team should work on the following deliverables.

Inception reports

An inception report specifies the methodologies used determining thereby the exact focus and scope of the exercise. Steps to take in developing the inception reports are:

- After selection, the research team is asked to provide a combined inception report for the performance study and the quasi-experimental study that specifically describes the baseline study.
- Based on the insights of the baseline studies, the inception report will be adapted by the research team for the mid-term and end-line studies.
- After the mid-term study, an inception report for the evaluation (Component 3) needs to be developed by the research team.

Inception reports will be assessed and fine-tuned in consultation with GUSO PMEL staff. The inception reports will be approved by the evaluation working group and act as an agreement on how the study is to be conducted.

Country-specific research designs

Following agreement on the inception reports, research designs need to be made country-specific. This process should take place in close collaboration with the designated team of the relevant country alliance, and includes the selection of the geographical area, sampling methodology, data collection plan, and translated tool(s). These need to be shared with and approved by the GUSO evaluation working group.

Reports: The following reports are required

- A baseline report, with outcomes per country in seven country paragraphs, and including a methodological chapter. The baseline reports are for internal use (country alliances and consortium), and will be shared with the donor.
- A mid-term report, comparing baselines with the mid-term measurement, with seven separate country paragraphs, conclusions and recommendations, and a methodological chapter. The mid-term reports are for internal use (country alliances and consortium), and will be shared with the donor.
- A programme performance report, describing the impact of the programme on the lives of young people, by comparing baseline with end line, showing trends, with seven country-specific paragraphs and one synthesis chapter. It should also contain conclusions, recommendations and a methodological chapter. This report is for both internal and external use. Country paragraphs will be shared with a wider audience in the relevant countries, and should be easy to understand for an educated lay reader.
- One report about the effect study with the potential to be published. This report should be technical and for an expert audience.
- One evaluation report containing separate annexes with evaluation summaries for the individual country programmes evaluated. This report is for both for internal and external use. It will be shared with a wider audience, and should be easy to understand for an educated lay reader.⁵

Feedback rounds and feedback workshops

For all reports, drafts need to be provided for feedback from the country alliances and consortium members. Reports need to be approved before proceeding to a next phase in the process, and before payments. Feedback meetings in which the results of the studies are shared need to take place in all countries after each study (baseline, mid-term, end-line). After the evaluation, feedback meetings need to be organised in two countries (to be selected) and in the Netherlands.

Communication

Regular updates on the process, for example on the country studies, are required. The applicant should address the communication process and collaboration between the different parties in their proposal.

Qualifications of lead researcher and research team

The consortium, through its lead agency Rutgers, wants to contract one (lead) organisation, responsible for the deliverables and the process implemented.

The consortium prefers local research institutes or consultants to implement the country-specific studies (in their country or a neighbouring country). These local parties will be sub-contracted by the lead agency.

Local research parties will translate the inception reports into local Terms of Reference, in partnership with the country alliance. Final approval will be given in consultation with the lead agent and GUSO evaluation working group.

The lead evaluation team should consist of persons meeting the following criteria:

- Master's degree in social sciences and advanced skills in quantitative and qualitative research methodologies.

⁵ The outline of this report will be developed in the course of the programme.

- Proven skills in the evaluation of SRHR programmes, particularly in long-term assignments such as this one.
- At least five years' experience in the development sector, with a primary focus on young people's SRHR.
- Knowledge of (adolescent) sexual and reproductive health and rights, meaningful youth participation, and collaborative programming.
- Have proven experience in using a mixed methodology approach (quantitative and qualitative), given that the consortium has a preference for participative and/or innovative approaches, especially meaningful youth participation.
- Affinity with young people and their sexual rights; sensitive to gender and rights.
- An extensive research network in the selected countries, or a network consisting of researchers with experience in SRHR and the selected countries.
- Ability to work independently, take initiative and respond appropriately to constructive feedback.
- Experience in sharing and discussing evaluation findings with clients, in-country partners and beneficiaries, in an appropriate way.

The members of the research team should not have been of staff of one of the members or partners of the consortium.

The research team should:

- Be willing to sign up to the consortium's ethical policy in research conduct.
- Be open to thinking about suitable communication and dissemination tools together with the country alliances and the consortium.
- Provide a vision for the collaboration between the research party and the consortium and the GUSO country alliances during the entire programme period.

The lead researcher of the research team will be the primary contact person for PMEL coordinator of the consortium, who coordinates the GUSO evaluation group, and should:

- Have proven experience in layered and complex evaluations.
- Have a strong methodological background in multi-country evaluations.
- Have proven experience in using a mixed methodology approach (quantitative and qualitative).
- Not have had any professional relationship with either the ASK or UFBR programme in the past three years.

In all countries, a qualified local research team should conduct the study. The lead party is required to provide short CVs of all members of the research team.

5 Roles, timeline and application

Roles:

The different stakeholders and persons or groups the team will directly or indirectly work with are:

The Steering Committee (SC) (consisting of the directors of the six member organisations) commissions the evaluations and oversees the whole process and deliverables. The SC authorises the evaluation working group to take critical decisions (e.g. regarding evaluation questions, contract partners, and approval of inception reports).

The (internal) GUSO evaluation working group is a small team involved in the entire process of the evaluation, including assessment of proposals, interviews and selection of the final candidate. It consists of representatives of all stakeholders involved in the alliance, in-country and in the Northern consortium.

The GUSO PMEL coordinator. The research team will regularly communicate with the PMEL coordinator. The evaluators will be working on a day-to-day basis with the PMEL-staff at the consortium office. The PMEL coordinator and the lead researcher will meet regularly for coordination and fine-tuning. A number of fixed moments in time will be planned to discuss progress towards the most important milestones, to discuss hampering factors or processes, and, when relevant, to discuss changes to the process.

The country alliances consist of several organisations, and each alliance has a specific organisational structure. Important contact persons are the National Programme Coordinator (NPC), the Youth Country Coordinator, the board of directors, the programme team, and the country alliance PMEL group.

Provisional timeline:

29 August 2016	Deadline for proposals
5-9 September 2016	Interviews with selected candidates
1 October 2016	Inception report for baseline studies
October-November 2016	Baseline studies
23 December 2016	Final baseline report (including review and comments)
January-February 2017	Co-organising country reflection workshops based on the baseline studies
January 2018	Inception report for mid-term evaluation
April-May 2018	Mid-term studies
1 July 2018	Mid-term report
September 2018	Co-organising reflection workshops
January 2020	Inception report for end-line studies
January 2020	Inception report for evaluation
February-March 2020	End-line studies and evaluation studies
1 June 2020	Final report

Application:

You can respond by sending your proposal to Marijke Priester, Consortium Manager (m.priester@rutgers.nl), and Margo Bakker, Consortium Officer (mbakker@rutgers.nl), before 29 August, 2016. Please express your interest in an outline of 10 pages at most, explaining how you would approach this assignment, including:

- Motivation;
- A vision for the collaboration between the research party and the consortium and the GUSO country alliances during the entire programme period;
- List of members of the research team;
- Description of research methodologies in relation to evaluation questions;
- Description of data collection and analysis;
- Description of approach to comparative study;
- Description of general process for ethical clearance;
- Description of approach to feedback workshops.

Please include in the annexes:

- CV, including relevant experience(s) and personal profile) of the lead researcher and members of the research team. From these documents it should be clear the lead researcher and the other members of the research team match the set criteria (see the paragraph 'Qualifications of lead researcher and research team').
- Overview of country-specific research institutes or consultants that will be involved in the programme during the entire period, including CVs of the lead researchers in each country.
- Detailed budget, including the number of days you would spend on the assignment and daily fees (budget should cover all costs in-country as well, including logistical costs). The proposal that will be selected will provide an appropriate balance between the quality and the costs of the evaluation. There is sufficient budget available for an extensive, high-quality evaluation.
- Concept planning from September 2016 to December 2020. When relevant include information about (non)availability of researchers.
- Two recent studies relating to SRHR conducted by the lead researcher.

For inquiries please contact, Marijke Priester through Rutgers' office (00 31 30 231 34 31).

Note 1. This call for proposals is distributed in the network of the consortium, but also through our websites and social media.

Note 2. Rutgers is no contracting authority within the meaning of the 'Aanbestedingswet 2012' (the Dutch Public Procurement Act). This tender procedure is a voluntary and private tender procedure. The Aanbestedingswet 2012 as well as the principles of procurement law are explicitly not applicable.

Applicants are hereby advised that Rutgers is not committed to any course of action as a result of its issuance of this Terms of Reference and/or its receipt of a proposal from the applicant or other forms in response to it. Rutgers reserves all rights and liberties regarding the tender procedure, including:

- the right to terminate the tender procedure at any moment in time;
- the right to reject any proposal;
- the right to engage negotiations with one or more parties (also third-parties) regarding the contract or a part thereof;
- the right to award the contract or a part thereof;
- the right to award the contract to one or more parties;
- the right to make any decision subject to conditions.
- the right not to award the contract;
- the right to depart from or modify the proposed framework and/or any other procedure in relation to the Terms of Reference.

Tenderers cannot claim compensation from Rutgers or any affiliated person or entity, in any way, in case any of the aforementioned situations occur.

Annex 1 Short description of the programme

Get Up Speak Out for Youth Rights

Get Up Speak Out (GUSO) is a five-year programme (2016-2020) developed by a consortium⁶ consisting of Rutgers, CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality, dance4life, International Planned Parenthood Federation, Simavi and STOP AIDS NOW!. The GUSO programme will be implemented in seven countries in Africa and Asia (Ethiopia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi, Pakistan and Uganda) together with around 40 partner organisations.

In this programme, the consortium aims to tackle the problem that young people do not claim their sexual and reproductive rights and their right to participation because of restrictions at community, societal, institutional and political levels. These restrictions hinder their access to comprehensive SRHR education and services that match their needs, and hamper their ability to make their own informed decisions concerning SRHR. The change the consortium envisages to make is that all young people, especially girls and young women, are empowered to realise their SRHR in societies that take a positive stance towards young people's sexuality.

The consortium has formulated five outcomes which should contribute to achieving this change:

1. Strengthened and sustainable alliances comprehensively address the SRHR of young people, including sensitive issues.
2. Empowered young people increasingly voice their rights.
3. Increased utilisation of comprehensive SRHR information and education by all young people.
4. Increased utilisation of high-quality and youth-friendly SRHR services that respond to the needs and rights of all young people.
5. Improved socio-cultural, political and legal environment for gender-sensitive, youth-friendly SRHR.

In each GUSO programme country, partner organisations have formed an alliance (referred to as country alliance) and developed country-specific GUSO plans. As the country programmes are based on the local context they differ from each other, but they all adhere to the overall GUSO Theory of Change.

Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (PMEL) in GUSO

Each country alliance developed its own specific PMEL framework to measure results. Included are some indicators that are the same for each country, called 'joint indicators' (see annex 3). Each country also developed country-specific indicators which match with their country plan. The joint indicators and the country specific indicators are included in the country specific PMEL frameworks.

Next to this operational research will be an integral part of the GUSO programme. Its core goal is to strengthen alliance partners' and members' capacities in evidence-based programming and programmatic learning. The exact research questions, methodologies, locations and partners in these OR projects will be determined in the course of 2016 and 2017, as country-specific OR agendas will also be developed and these agendas will influence each other and need to be aligned.

⁶ A consortium is an association of organisations that has been set up for a particular temporary purpose, in this case the implementation of the GUSO programme. When we use the term Alliance, we refer to organisations that have joined forces for mutual benefit, or to carry out certain tasks jointly.

Annex 2 Definitions

Consortium	The consortium (also referred to as the Dutch/UK consortium) consists of Rutgers, CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality, dance4life, International Planned Parenthood Federation, Simavi and STOP AIDS NOW!. Together with 40 partner organisations in Africa and Asia they implement the GUSO programme.
(In-) Country alliance	An (in-) country alliance consists of the partner organisations of the consortium members in the programme countries. These partners work together to implement GUSO in their country.
Effect study	Effect study refers to a quasi-experimental study (study with a comparison group).
Impact	Impact refers to the positive changes the programme has brought about in the lives of the beneficiaries. Impact does not refer to impact studies (with counterfactuals).
Impact indicators	Impact indicators refer to the indicators measuring our long-term objectives, which include changes for the beneficiaries resulting from the accumulation of outcomes.
Performance study	Performance study refers to measurement of (progress towards) intended results, as reflected in the outcome indicators and impact indicators.
Outcomes	Outcomes refer to changes (behavioural/organisational/policies) that result from the project outputs.
Outputs	Outputs refer to the tangible results of our activities.
Research Team	The team that will be selected to conduct the research (sometimes referred to as external party or institute).

Annex 3 Overview of the joint indicators

Red indicators are indicators that will be measured by the external party.

LONG-TERM OBJECTIVE: All young people are empowered to realise their SRHR in societies that have a positive attitude towards young people's sexuality		
Indicator: Positive change in gender attitudes, empowerment, and self-esteem among young people in the programme areas.		
Indicator: Positive change in sexual health.		
OUTCOME 1 STRONG AND SUSTAINABLE ALLIANCES		
Output indicators	Outcome indicators	Process questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of people from the country alliances that have received training (by training/by participants/gender/age). Group/provider of training). Number of people trained by the country alliances and/or individual partners (by training/by participants/gender/age group). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country alliance is strengthened and more sustainable (internal strength/external recognition/financial sustainability). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe 1-3 major trajectories/events that demonstrate how the alliance (increasingly) strengthens its position in the SRHR sector. Describe 1-3 important strategies implemented to strengthen the organisational and financial aspects of the alliance.
OUTCOME 2 YOUNG PEOPLE INCREASINGLY VOICE THEIR RIGHTS		
Output indicators	Outcome indicators	Process questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth representation in the SRHR alliance structures and decision-making processes. Number of collaborations among young people from different alliance-related organisations/networks that represent the youth constituency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young people increasingly feel supported by adults in their organisations/the country alliance. Young people increasingly feel empowered to contribute to changes for the target group and in the socio-political environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe 1 or 2 strategies that are in place to ensure a constant flow of young people trained and engaged in decision-making processes. Describe 1-3 important strategies implemented by the alliance to foster and strengthen youth movements/networks and/or help young people to organise themselves to work together. Describe 1 or 2 strategies that are in place to ensure a variety of young people, representing different groups, are involved and engaged.
OUTCOME 3 INCREASED UTILISATION OF COMPREHENSIVE SRHR INFORMATION AND EDUCATION BY ALL PEOPLE		
Output indicators	Outcome indicators	Process indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of educators trained. Number of young of people reached with (comprehensive) SRHR information and education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased capacity of educators to deliver comprehensive SRHR information and education. Increased % of young people who are reached with SRHR information and education from the GUSO programme. Increased % of young people who perceive the SRHR information and education as beneficial to them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to ensure the quality (content) of SRHR information and education. The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to monitor high-quality implementation of SRHR information and education. The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to ensure the sustainability of SRHR information and education delivery.
OUTCOME 4 INCREASED UTILISATION OF HIGH-QUALITY SRH SERVICES THAT RESPOND TO THE NEEDS AND RIGHTS OF ALL YOUNG PEOPLE		
Output indicators	Outcome indicators	Process indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of service providers who have been trained in YFS. Number of SRH services provided to young people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased % of young people (from the catchment area) who access high-quality SRH services, including modern contraception and safe abortion for young people. Increased % of young people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to improve the quality and inclusiveness of youth-friendly services. The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to strengthen referral systems (SRHR

	<p>who use the referral system to access SRH services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decreased % of young people with an unmet need for SRH services. 	education/information to SRHR services, and services to services).
OUTCOME 5 IMPROVED SOCIO-CULTURAL, POLITICAL AND LEGAL ENVIRONMENT FOR YOUNG PEOPLE'S SRHR		
Output indicators	Outcome indicators	Process indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of people reached by campaigns and (social) media. Number of people structurally involved in the implementation of the programme at community level (for example youth groups, CBOs, peer educators). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress towards high-quality implementation of (country-specific) SRHR policies and legislation. Young people experience increased support from important stakeholders and gatekeepers in accessing and using SRHR information and services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Describe the major processes and progress of your pathway of change in advocacy, including enabling and constraining factors.</i> The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to deal with opposition and to find allies.

Annex 4 Available background information for the evaluation team, which can be provided upon request

- Approved GUSO programme proposal and GUSO programme document.
- PMEL protocol.
- Country programme proposals, and country annual plans for 2016-2017.
- Evaluation reports, annual report 2015 and end of programme reports for ASK and UFBR (including outcome measurement reports).
- Operational research reports from ASK and UFBR.
- PME support tools: output and outcome support tools in which the indicators are explained and defined, and tools to measure the indicators.
- Essential Packages: for the ASK programme, the Essential Packages Manual was developed. In the Essential Packages Manual, the minimum standards for all key interventions and strategies for SRHR programming are described.
- Facebook pages and websites: most country alliances and/or individual partner organisations have websites, or Facebook pages that are part of the running programmes. GUSO consortium members also have their own websites.