TERM OF REFERNCE (TOR)

ASSIGNMENT:	FEASIBILITY STUDY
PROJECT:	Integrated WASH and Climate Resilient Livelihoods for the Communities of Namayingo and Kumi districts, Uganda
DONOR:	BMZ
COUNTRY / DISTRICTS:	Uganda (Namayingo and Kumi districts)
DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT:	20 days
START DATE:	1st Sep 2025

Table of Contents

1.0. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE 3

1.2. PROJECT BENEFICIARIES 5

2.0. PURPOSE AND USE OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY 7

2.1. PURPOSE OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY 7

2.2. USE OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY 8

3.0. EVALUATION OF THE PLANNED PROJECT BASED ON OECD-DAC CRITERIA 8

3.1. RELEVANCE 8

3.2. COHERENCE 9

3.3. EFFECTIVENESS 9

3.4. EFFICIENCY 10

3.5. IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE) 10

3.6. SUSTAINABILITY 11

8. METHODOLOGY 13

9. RECOMMENDATIONS 14

10. LOGISTICS AND TIMELINE 15

11. DELIVERABLES 16

12. BUDGET 16

13. SELECTION CRITERIA AND TECHNICAL EXPERTISE 16

14. APPLICATION PROCEDURES & REQUIREMENTS 17

1.0. Background and Rationale

Uganda continues to confront significant obstacles in achieving equitable access to water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), with rural and underserved districts disproportionately affected. According to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP, 2023), only 12% of Ugandans have access to safely managed drinking water, while a mere 18% benefit from safely managed sanitation services and just 38% of rural households have basic handwashing facilities with soap and water. These stark national averages mask even deeper disparities in districts such as Namayingo and Kumi, which face chronic underinvestment, inadequate infrastructure, and escalating climate-induced challenges. This mirrors broader trends in Sub-Saharan Africa, where over 400 million people still lack basic drinking water services and nearly 70% of rural populations have no access to safely managed sanitation, thus underscoring the urgency for targeted, climate-resilient WASH investments in vulnerable regions.

Access to safe water in Namayingo and Kumi districts remains critically inadequate. The needs assessment carried out by HFHU in May 2025 revealed that, over 90% of households in Namayingo and 83.8% in Kumi depend on unsafe open water sources. Only 41.3% of respondents across the districts access safe drinking water, with piped systems and rainwater harvesting nearly absent. Distance is a major barrier with 29.4% of households walking more than one kilometer to fetch water, especially in Tisai (Kumi) and nearly 60% walk between 500 meters and over 1 km. Water quality concerns (60.1%) and seasonal shortages (22.1%) further hinder access, while household water treatment is alarmingly low. Only 24% of families treat their drinking water, with the majority consuming it untreated, posing serious health risks. These findings emphasize the need for investments in safe water infrastructure, localized supply systems, and robust community education on water treatment.

Sanitation and hygiene conditions in Namayingo and Kumi districts reveal critical gaps and disparities. In Tisai parish (Kumi), open defecation remains widespread (90%), while Namayingo (14.8%) also exhibits poor coverage. In Kumi district only 4.5% utilize shared latrines, and 24.6% in Namayingo rely on open pits, posing environmental risks.

Latrine maintenance is largely neglected only 24% clean them daily, with Kumi reporting the lowest rate (6%). Handwashing infrastructure is virtually absent, with 82.6% lacking stations and just 16% consistently using soap and water. Alarmingly, 10% never wash their hands.

Financial barriers (80.4%), low awareness (50.5%), and difficult terrain hinder sanitation improvements. Vulnerable groups children (58%), persons with disabilities (21%), and the elderly (15%) are disproportionately affected. Furthermore, WASH governance remains weak; only 9% of local committees are active. These findings demand urgent investments in infrastructure, behavioral change, and inclusive governance.

The needs assessment revealed that, Menstrual hygiene management (MHM) in Namayingo and Kumi districts is severely constrained by limited education, access, and entrenched stigma. Only 27% of respondents had received any MHM education; 0% in Namayingo district with health centers (37.7%) and parents (31.1%) serving as the main information sources. Cultural taboos and gender norms inhibit dialogue, with just 22% feeling very comfortable discussing menstruation issues, and 12% completely uncomfortable. Usage of menstrual products is mixed: while 47.7% use disposable pads, 31.7% rely on cloth and 4.9% on cotton wool, particularly in Lugala and Tisai parishes in Namayingo and Kumi districts respectively. Just 13.3% of respondents indicated that menstrual hygiene products are easily accessible, with high costs (81.4%) and limited local availability (30.3%) emerging as the most significant obstacles to adequate supply. Disposal practices are often unsafe with 47.1% respondents use pit latrines and 19% lack any proper method. Silence and stigma persist, with 67.5% considering menstruation as unspoken topic.

WASH Gaps in surveyed primary schools based on 2025 gross enrollment indicate there is critical WASH deficits, especially in Budala P/S which lacks 14 VIP latrines and 19 handwashing stands. Tisai Island and Mayanja P/S also show major shortfalls with no handwashing stations and inadequate latrine coverage. Kaswabuli P/S has a severe latrine gap for girls. According to Uganda's national WASH in Schools (WinS) guidelines, the recommended standard is one stance per 25 girls and one per 40 boys, and at least one inclusive latrine and one functional handwashing station per block. Overall, handwashing facilities are severely underprovided across all schools, and latrine ratios fall short of standards, compromising pupil hygiene, dignity, and inclusion especially for girls and children with disabilities.

The needs assessment revealed that, communities face acute climate-related risks such as drought (78.9%), erratic rainfall (57.6%), rising temperatures (52.3%), and crop pests (38.5%), threatening agricultural productivity. Community awareness levels on climate change also vary widely with Kumi district leads with 92%, while Namayingo lags behind. Preparedness remains low, with just 5.9% feeling ready. Livelihood diversification (63.5%) and crop rotation (55.3%) are common adaptation practices. Innovative strategies like apiculture,

aquaculture, and kitchen gardening offer localized resilience. Limited readiness, especially in Namayingo, underscores the need for targeted awareness and climate-smart livelihood programs tailored to district-specific vulnerabilities.

Habitat for Humanity Uganda plans to implement an integrated community resilience project to contribute to improved health, dignity, and climate resilience through sustainable access to safe water, improved sanitation, hygiene behavior, and inclusive livelihood opportunities for vulnerable populations in Namayingo & Kumi districts. This initiative contributes to several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by addressing key development challenges in Namayingo and Kumi districts. It contributes to SDG 6 by improving access to clean water, adequate sanitation, and hygiene services; SDG 13 by enhancing community resilience to climate shocks such as drought and erratic rainfall through climate-smart WASH and livelihood strategies; SDG 1 by reducing poverty through improved basic services and sustainable income-generating opportunities; SDG 8 by supporting decent work and economic empowerment, particularly for youth and women; SDG 11 by strengthening inclusive, resilient community infrastructure and governance systems; and SDG 5 by promoting gender equality through menstrual hygiene management, gender-sensitive WASH facilities, and the inclusion of women and girls in leadership and decision-making.

This project directly supports Uganda's national development priorities as outlined in the Third National Development Plan (NDPIII) and the Uganda National WASH Strategic Investment Plan, which emphasize universal access to safe water, improved sanitation, hygiene behavior change, and climate resilience as key drivers of human capital development and socio-economic transformation. By focusing on integrated WASH and climate-smart livelihoods in underserved districts, the project contributes to operationalizing government strategies such as the Water and Environment Sector Development Plan (2015–2025) and the National Adaptation Plan for Climate Change, while also reinforcing district-level development plans and institutional capacity.

Specifically, the project will

1. Enhance access to safe and sustainable water supply for underserved communities
2. Improved community behaviors and practices of sanitation and hygiene by 2029
3. Increased households' resilience to the adverse effects of climate change through adaptive WASH strategies and sustainable livelihood practices.
4. Strengthened Institutional and Local Capacity for Sustainability

1.2. Project beneficiaries

1.2.1. Direct beneficiaries

The proposed project will directly benefit an estimated 10,000 vulnerable individuals across Namayingo and Kumi districts. Beneficiaries will be selected through a transparent, community-led process involving Habitat Uganda's technical teams, local institutions, and elected leaders. Household selection will be guided by clear HFHU vulnerability criteria including gender, chronic health conditions, disability status, poverty level, household size, and access to water and sanitation services. The selection process starts with community awareness of the project and beneficiary selection criteria, nomination of partner families, field level family assessments, validation of selected families and community feedback. All are done in a transparent and participatory manner to ensure fairness and ownership.

The composition of beneficiaries is intentionally diverse:

- Women and girls (approximately 70%)—primarily burdened by water insecurity and menstrual health challenges;
- Youth (18–35), targeted for climate-resilient livelihood training;
- Persons with disabilities, prioritized for inclusive WASH services and leadership roles; and
- School-aged children, especially adolescent girls, supported through menstrual hygiene and ASRH initiatives

1.2.2. Indirect beneficiaries

The project is expected to indirectly benefit over 30,000 individuals through community-wide, institutional, and market-driven ripple effects. These beneficiaries include households surrounding project sites who gain access to shared water and sanitation infrastructure, government staff whose capacities will be enhanced through training and collaboration, and traders and small businesses invigorated by demand from youth- and women-led enterprises. Public school students and health facility users will experience improved hygiene, while local organizations and Village Health Teams will benefit from exposure to inclusive WASH models and training resources. Furthermore, the project's tools and approaches will be shared with regional development stakeholders, fostering replication, policy influence, and broader sector learning across Eastern Uganda.

The Stakeholders across micro (households, youth, VHTs), meso (community leaders, artisans, schools), and macro (government agencies, donors, private sector, civil society) levels will influence and sustain the intervention, contributing resources, expertise, and institutional collaboration. No major conflicts of interest were identified, suggesting a conducive environment for inclusive, transparent, and community-owned implementation.

2. Purpose and use of the feasibility study

2.1. Purpose of the Feasibility Study

The feasibility study aims to determine the technical, financial, environmental, and social viability of implementing an integrated WASH and livelihood resilience project; by assessing the viability of achieving the intended project outcomes including enhancing access to safe and sustainable water supply for underserved communities, improving community behaviors and practices of sanitation and hygiene, increasing households' resilience to the adverse effects of climate change through adaptive WASH strategies and sustainable livelihood practices and strengthening Institutional and Local Capacity for WASH Sustainability in Namayingo and Kumi Districts. It will examine how conducive the current sectoral conditions, community capacities, institutional frameworks, and regional contexts are to achieving these outcomes. In doing so, the study will also explore design and implementation parameters-including delivery models, technology suitability, community engagement approaches, and mechanisms for sustaining behavior change and livelihood resilience. Specifically, the study will: -

- Assess expected merit and worth of project based on Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) evaluation criteria.
- Provide specific recommendations for the impact matrix and project activities
- Provide a sound, empirically verified basis for the project, identify and verify material assumptions and prerequisites for project success, identify risks and risk mitigation strategies
- Assess the feasibility of the project objective(s). How conducive is the context (sector, components, project regions) with regard to the projects' objective?
- Examine needs assessment document and verify project concept, identify weaknesses, and provide recommendations for optimisation
- Present project context at community, regional, and national level, including relevant baseline data
- Optimise the project concept, improve quality, and maximise impact and sustainability based on recommendations.
- Assess WASH infrastructure and service gaps, hygiene practices, and livelihood vulnerabilities.
- Explore the social, environmental, and institutional conditions within the target districts.
- Identify risks, delivery models, and culturally responsive behavior change approaches.
- Review existing policies, stakeholder readiness, and alignment with SDGs and Uganda's NDPIII.
- Assess community willingness and capacity to manage, co-finance, or sustain interventions post-project.
- Generate actionable recommendations to refine project design, implementation modalities, and sustainability mechanisms.

2.2. Use of the Feasibility Study

The findings will inform a realistic and adaptive project design, guiding strategic decisions around activity prioritization, budgeting, stakeholder coordination, and risk mitigation. Findings from the feasibility study will inform project design and implementation strategy including activity prioritization, budgeting, and stakeholder mapping; support decision-making and resource mobilization by providing evidence to donors, partners, and government stakeholders, while identifying scalable models and opportunities for replication in similar contexts. It will guide community engagement and behavior change programming by identifying culturally appropriate and locally led approaches. It will strengthen monitoring, evaluation, and learning frameworks by providing a critical evidence base for refining the MEAL framework, ensuring adaptive management and accountability throughout the project lifecycle.

3. Evaluation of the planned project based on OECD-DAC criteria

Following are the objectives of the proposed study structured along DAC criteria and identified *data needs* to strengthen the conceptualization of the project and *DAC Questions for assessing the feasibility (minimum requirement by donor) of the suggested project concept*

3.1. Relevance

(Is the intervention doing the right things?)

- What needs has the target group expressed in order to rectify identified problems during the FGDs and KIIs?
- Does the proposed intervention tackle a core development bottleneck in the target districts?
- How well does the project align with national development frameworks and SDGs?
- Are project approaches and objectives clearly defined and relevant to beneficiary capacities and diversity?
- Do institutional, cultural/norms, or regional factors present structural obstacles to implementation?
- Is the project designed to be conflict-sensitive (Do No Harm Principle)?

Target group analysis

- Who is part of the target group and what criteria exist for selecting this target group? Are there perhaps several target groups that are affected in different ways? What are the criteria for selecting target groups? How are do-no-harm aspects considered?
- How homogenous or heterogeneous is the target group with regard to factors such as gender, ethnic origin, age, language, capacity, etc., and to what extent must the project take this into account?

- What role is played by the target group(s) in socio-economic context? Which conflicts of interest with other population groups could arise through this funding?
- Analysis of the capacities target group: Which potential does the target group have, particularly with regard to its own initiative, self-help efforts and local problem-solving capacities? How can this be strengthened?

3.2. Coherence

How suitable is the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector or institution?

Data Needs for optimizing

- Does the planned project tie in with the government's development strategy?
- Are there any policy issues related to programming in WASH and climate resilience livelihood which are to be addressed by appropriate stakeholders?

Assessing feasibility

- How does the planned project contribute to Habitat for Humanity Uganda strategies and programs?
- To what extent do synergies and connections exist between the planned project and other interventions by the same stakeholder (organization) and other stakeholders?
- What similarities or overlaps exist between the beneficiaries and projects implemented by other actors in the same context? To what extent does the intervention add value and avoid duplication?

3.3. Effectiveness

Which project approach is best for achieving the objectives?

Data needs for optimizing

- Which socio-cultural barriers exist with regard to suggested integrated WASH and climate resilience livelihood approaches, and how can these be overcome?
- Which barriers exist regarding gender equality and social inclusion in WASH initiatives and how can these be overcome?
- Are suggested interventions for women, girls, disabled persons and youth effectively contributing to improved health, dignity, and climate resilience in Namayingo and Kumi Districts.
- Is the chosen methodological approach suitable and sufficient for achieving the project objective? Are alternatives required?

Assessing feasibility

- Are the cause-effect relationships (including assumptions) plausible? What negative effects might arise? Which negative consequences could project measures or sub-objectives bring about?

- To what extent can this be considered in the project (concept) – e.g. "do no harm" approach, gender, equity and inclusion, etc.?
- At what level (multi-level approach) do you anticipate implementing additional measures to increase effectiveness?
- How will changes be measured? What indicators (fields) are most suitable?

Project partner and stakeholder analysis

- Who are the most important government and non-government stakeholders in this sector? Who are the most important ones in the project location, in the planned districts of Namayingo and Kumi in Uganda?
- Who are the potential partners? What have the potential partners already been practicing in WASH and climate resilience livelihood?
- What interests do the stakeholders have? Are any conflicts of interest evident? What interactions exist with other stakeholder project? How do they find their way into the project concept?
- Do the stakeholders have a common understanding of the problems? Have they derived project objectives from this?
- How big is the various stakeholders' support for the project? In what ways can they influence the project and to what extent?
- Which capacities do the selected partners (institutional, technical, personnel and financial) offer and which capacities relevant for the project are missing?
- Which measures are necessary for strengthening the organization and capacity of the local structures/ CSOs/ partners?
- Which vested interest/ownership will the local implementing partners have in the success of the project?
- What kind of relationship do local partners have with the target group and stakeholders (legitimacy)?

3.4. Efficiency

Is the proposed project's planned use of funds a cost-effective method to achieve its objectives?

- To what extent can the planned measures be implemented with the envisaged funds and personnel in the proposed time period?
- To what extent can the envisaged spending be allocated cost-effectively, and are the investments, operating expenses and personnel in proportion to the intended goal?
- How well can

3.5. Impact (significance)

what contribution does the planned project make to achieving higher-level development policy impact?

- What particular contribution does the project objective (outcome) make to the overall objective (impact)?
- To what extent does the planned project build structures, set examples and have a broad impact? On what levels will norms or structures be changed?

3.6. Sustainability

Will the positive effects remain once the project has ended (without additional external funding)?

Data Needs for optimizing

- To what extent can local potential, structures and procedures be built on?

Assessing feasibility

- Which measures and instruments are most suitable for strengthening local ownership, participation and capacities?
- How will you ensure that structures developed in the project (e.g. self-help groups, water committees, women's cooperatives) will remain operational, or that knowledge acquired through training will be put into practice and passed on to others?

4. Local project partner in the partner country

- Which organization(s) have been selected as local project partner(s), and why? Who suggested the idea for the project? How will you improve the local project partner's ownership?
- Do any formal agreements exist between the stakeholders? To what extent have existing agreements between stakeholders been formalized?
- Are the partners' resources and strengths, both individually and at an organizational level, well understood?
- What relevant professional, methodological and political competencies, both at an individual and an organizational level, will be further developed?

5. Beneficiaries and other stakeholders (on a micro-, meso- and macro-level)

- How are the direct beneficiaries selected, and by whom? What criteria exist for selecting these beneficiaries?

- What is the composition of each beneficiary? How homogeneous or heterogeneous are the beneficiaries with regard to factors such as gender, ethnic origin, age, sexual orientation, language, and capacity, and to what extent must the project take this into account?
- What potential does each beneficiary have for self-help? How well are the beneficiaries equipped for self-help? How can local problem-solving capabilities be improved
- Do the beneficiaries and other stakeholders have a common understanding of the problems, prioritizing process and objectives of the project? Do the interests of other stakeholders align? Do any conflicts of interest exist?
- How strong is the various stakeholders' support for the project, for example, in terms of their own contribution? In what ways might they influence the project?

6. Stakeholders

Do the key stakeholders for hardware investment activities (communities, water point committees etc) fulfil the following criteria:

- Not-for profit entities (project outputs must not benefit for-profit entities!)
- Can guarantee appropriate and sustainable long-term operation of infrastructure created in the project, in line with the project´s goals and objectives
- Can guarantee inclusive, non-discriminatory, equitable, and affordable access to project outputs and outcomes in the long run, in line with the project´s goals and objectives
- Can guarantee that any infrastructure created in the project will be built on publicly owned land and both the land and the infrastructure will remain in public, not-for-profit ownership for the long run
- There are adequate provisions in place for the democratic control of the assets (explain what these are and make recommendations for feasible improvements, if any)
- Are marginalised communities involved in the project activities e.g. youth, women or people living with disability?
- What measures will be necessary to ensure the fulfilment of the criteria in the above point?
- What measures will be necessary to ensure the long-term sustainability of other outputs and outcomes (e.g., newly established or strengthened community structures, new skills and knowledge transferred in the project, behavioural change)?

7. WASH technology

Does the proposed WASH technical designs fulfil the following criteria?

- Aligned with national policy or guidelines
- Moderate to high likelihood of being adopted by communities or government institutions

- Replicability in terms of technology, materials, and cost or any other factor which should be determined by the consultant
- Reliable in terms of ease of both use and maintenance
- Affordability of maintenance services including desludging
- Design has taken into consideration climate resilience
- Design has considered local water sources (groundwater, rainwater or streams available, how much capacity, what quality)
- Minimal to negligible impact on the natural environment including groundwater and other water sources
- Collect water (ground and surface) water levels, transmissivities, water quality, etc and help identify suitable places with good recharge.
- In terms of water quantity or even the environment. Conduct a quick check on the hydrological/hydrogeological studies could also help reduce fears of water quality. If some risks are identified in relation to water quality, a plan on mitigation including what equipment needs to be looked into /budgeted to treat water or resolve the identified risk.
- Cost implication: for any water technology identified, conduct hydrological/hydrogeological studies which can determine the cost implications including mobilization cost.
- Look into any and recommend any environmental and social impact assessments be done before water wells/boreholes are drilled or rehabilitated.
- What measures will be necessary to ensure the fulfilment of the criteria in the above point i.e. technologies recommend or any preferable alternatives to the proposed WASH technologies?

8. Methodology

The feasibility study will adopt a tailored, participatory mixed-methods approach, developed by the consultant to meet the specific objectives of the assignment. The methodology will integrate qualitative and quantitative techniques to ensure robust evidence generation and inclusive stakeholder engagement.

Initial desk research will be conducted to review the project concept note, relevant documentation from similar initiatives, and publicly available government data, such as the Uganda Water Supply Atlas, National Population and Housing Census Reports, Uganda Demographic and Health Survey (UDHS), and WASH Sector Performance Reports from the Ministry of Water and Environment. This will be complemented by a review of District Development Plans, WASH investment profiles, and health and education statistics for Namayingo and Kumi, to ensure that the study reflects localized priorities, service gaps, and institutional realities. This will support a contextual analysis and inform the design of data collection tools. The study will also map ongoing interventions

around community-led total sanitation (CLTS), school WASH programs, menstrual hygiene initiatives, solar-powered water systems, and climate-smart agriculture pilots by other NGOs and assess current implementation conditions to gauge feasibility.

Data will be collected using participatory tools, including key informant interviews with officials and technical experts, focus group discussions with diverse community members, and participatory mapping exercises to identify local assets and risks. Household surveys administered through digital platforms such as Kobo Collect and ODK will quantify community needs and service gaps. These findings will be triangulated with secondary data for validation.

Stakeholders including households' members, community structures / VHTs, government representatives, donors, CSOs, private sector actors, and community leaders will be engaged through interviews, surveys, focus groups, and validation workshops. Specific tools will be applied for capacity assessments, stakeholder analysis, gender inclusion, and Do No Harm considerations to ensure socially responsive and contextually appropriate recommendations.

9. Recommendations

On the basis of the main findings and the evaluation according to the OECD-DAC criteria, what concrete suggestions can be made or incorporated into the project concept in its specific context? Examples:

- What components, if any, are missing from the project concept to make the cause-effect relation-ships more coherent and to sustainably achieve the planned objectives? What planned components are not suitable or may have a negative impact, and for what reasons?
- Can the assumptions of cause-effect relationships be supported?
- What findings and project-relevant data from the study are suitable for inclusion in the project logic (impact matrix of the project proposal)? What are the recommendations for possible impact monitoring and data collection indicators?

Documents to be reviewed

The consultant individual/company should review the following documents provided by HFHU while developing the methodology of feasibility study:

- Draft project proposal and impact matrix
- Guidance documents from HFH Germany and/or BMZ
- HFHU Child and Adult Safeguarding policy

Research ethics

The consultant/ company must put in place specific safeguards and protocols to protect the safety (both physical and psychological) of respondents and those collecting the data as well as to prevent harm. This must ensure the rights of the individual are protected and participation in the feasibility study does not result in further violation of their rights.

The consultants must have a plan in place to:

- Protect the rights of respondents, including privacy and confidentiality.
- Elaborate on how informed consent will be obtained and to ensure that the names of individuals consulted during data collection will not be made public.
- If the project involves children (people under 18 years old) the Consultant must consider additional risks and need for parental consent.
- Data collection tools must be designed in a way that is culturally appropriate and does not create distress for respondents.
- Data collection visits should be organized at the appropriate time and place to minimize risk to respondents.

10. Logistics and timeline

The feasibility study is expected to be conducted in August 2025 while the finalization of the feasibility study report is anticipated by 3rd September 2025. The key task & phases are as follow:

a. **Proposal phase:** the consultant will be requested to submit a proposal (including methodological approach and feasibility study matrix), work plan and a budget breakdown for HFHU consideration.
b. **Inception Phase:** upon approval of the feasibility study proposal, the consultant is expected to review the internal and external documents to develop a detailed methodology including the data collection tools (KII guides) and actual work plan.
c. **Preparation & Field Phase:** In coordination with HFHU and district level partners, arrangement of interviews, stakeholder meetings and other data collection as relevant will be done.
d. **Reporting Phase:** the consultant will develop a feasibility study report as per BMZ study guidelines, consolidate the feedback received from HFHU, Africa Area Office and project donor and submit the final report. The contractor should be available for questions and call if there is a need for clarification, respond to follow-up questions, and participate in review calls as needed to ensure conformity with donor expectations and support final decision-making.
e. **Presentation or participation in the planning workshop:** the consultant might be requested to participate in the project design verification workshop (if relevant).

11. Deliverables

a) Inception Report (including detailed methodology and tools); 10-15 pages by 8th Sep 2025 (based on HFHU/BMZ format)

b) Draft Feasibility Report by 20th Sep 2025 for review by HFHU

c) Final Feasibility Study Report incorporating key programmatic and conceptual recommendations by 30th Sep 2025

d) Workshop Presentation (Key Summary Report)

e) Data sets (both qualitative and quantitative)

12. Budget

The consultant individual/company is expected to submit financial proposal with the detailed work plan and cost breakdown for the feasibility study. The budget should include any cost related to execute the study, any costs beyond the proposed budget will not be approved by HFHU.

13. Selection Criteria and Technical Expertise

- At least 8 years of expertise to carry out quantitative and qualitative analysis / feasibility studies related to WASH and climate resilience livelihoods.
- Proof of advanced degree qualification from recognized institution in rural water enterprises, smart agriculture, environmental health, agribusiness, resettlement schemes, climate change adaptation, project management, international development or a related field
- Technical knowledge of the consultants/ firms on WASH, climate resilience agriculture/ livelihood. Demonstration of the participation of similar studies or projects in the past 5 years.
- Fluent in English (knowledge of Ateso and Lusoga language for data collectors)
- Technical competency to lead feasibility study and stakeholder analysis, project management and data quality control
- Use of innovative technologies, including mobile data collection (survey CTO, ODK, Kobocollect, etc.
- Ability to draw practical conclusions and to prepare well written reports in a timely manner and availability during the proposed period.

Other Considerations

1. The contractor should be a registered entity with the relevant authorities in Uganda.
2. The contractor should have experience in humanitarian/development operations. Experience working on one of the Habitat for Humanity Uganda program areas and monitoring programs would be an advantage.

3. The contractor should have field presence in the program areas with established physical offices and adequate personnel.
4. The contractor should have a transparent institutional and financial management framework including but not limited to technical knowledge, information management systems and documentation, accounting and audit practice.
5. The contractor will be responsible for its own arrangement for security, transportation, communications, accommodation and insurance within districts targeted by the project. HFHU will not be responsible for any transportation or security concerns.

14. Application procedures & requirements:

Qualified and interested firms/individual consultants who meet or exceed the stated requirements are invited to submit their technical and financial proposal addressed to:

The Chairperson Procurement,

The Procurement Committee
Habitat for Humanity Uganda.
Plot 1026, Lukadde Road, Kyaliwajjala, Kira Ward

Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate a clear understanding of the Ugandan WASH and climate resilience context, and highlight any prior work in similar districts or with comparable stakeholders.

Submission should include or consider the following:

i. Attach at least two recent work samples from reputable organizations
ii. A capability statement, including demonstrated ability to execute the assignment.
iii. Updated curriculum vitae of the consultant team; clearly spells out qualifications and experiences aligned to the tasks.
iv. Commitment that the consultant team or firm will be entirely engaged if consultancy is awarded.
v. All submissions should have accurate and complete information. Submissions should contain full names and address of the entity, contact person and telephone number(s), email address and entity website where applicable.
vi. Responses to this TOR shall be delivered in sealed envelope (ONE COPY STRICKLY) clearly marked with details as per the example *"FEASIBILITY STUDY-BMZ-II"* . Firms/Consultants shall submit a flash disk/Compact Disc with details of the documents as in the sealed envelope (The Flash/ Compact Disc will be returned to the bidder).
vii. Electronic/ Soft copy submissions of bids will not be considered.

viii. *The deadline for all submissions is August 28th 2025 at 1:00pm EAT.*

ix. Bid opening will be at 2:00pm on August 28th 2025 at Habitat for Humanity Uganda offices.

x. All firms/consultants MUST send representative (s) during the Bid Opening.

xi. All inquiries and submissions should be addressed to the attention of:

For further inquiries, please send an email to: procomm@hfhuganda.org /noffice@hfhuganda.org

a. Disclaimer:

- *HFHU reserves the right to reject any or all bides, if such is in the best interest of the organization.*
- *HFHU does not charge any fee(s) at whichever stage of the procurement process.*