## ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHA</td>
<td>Anti-Homosexuality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCHRCL</td>
<td>Civil Society for Human Rights and Constitutional Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI</td>
<td>Defenders Protection Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHAHRDP</td>
<td>East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARUG</td>
<td>Freedom and Roam Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGHR</td>
<td>Fund for Global Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRAPF</td>
<td>Human Rights Awareness and Promotion Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRDs</td>
<td>Human Rights Defenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBU</td>
<td>Ice Breakers Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbians, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender And Intersex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLH</td>
<td>The Norwegian LGBT Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Security Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACT</td>
<td>Rights Evidence Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHFM</td>
<td>Rainbow Health Foundation Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLP</td>
<td>Refugee Law Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUG</td>
<td>Sexual Minorities Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOGIE</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWG</td>
<td>Security Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEU</td>
<td>Transgender Equality Uganda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The evaluation of Security Emergency Response mechanisms, like other emergency situations is influenced by the ad hoc unanticipated nature and involvement of many relief efforts and agencies (in this case the NSC and other actors), the beneficiaries and international organizations (donors). Two particularly common reasons to evaluate emergency response are 1) desire to enhance the committee’s response capacity and 2) accountability to donors. This evaluation report briefly endeavors to review the performance of the NSC’s response to the security needs of the LGBT community members to her mandate and to chart a way forward. The report concludes that the NSC has worked within its mandate. It, however, needs to restructure, realign and retool. Albeit accounting for resources was straightforward, it was difficult to establish who the NSC is accountable to.

Summary of Key Findings.

- More than half (67.4%) of the respondents had heard of the National LGBT security committee
- More than half (60.4%) of the respondents to the survey knew about the composition of the NSC by names and persons
- Over half (50) of the survey participants mentioned that they could reach NSC through the NSC-specific members
- More than half of the respondents (31) reported that they did not know how effective the NSC’s partners were in supporting the NSC to execute its mandate.
- Most of the respondents recommended that the Committee should be representative of all levels and categories in the LGBTI community.
- There is a need for increased financial support and protection to members.
- The Committee should involve and sensitize the community in all activities.
- Clear and transparent criteria for selecting members and voting procedures should be instituted.
2. OVERVIEW

Members of the LGBT community and the donor community have clamored for an improvement in the performance and quality of service of the NSC. For this improvement to be achieved, there was a need to establish a baseline. This baseline was established to be the circumstances under which the NSC was constituted, the prevailing conditions at the time and the goals set for it to achieve.

Based on this baseline, an evaluation was conducted. At the root of the word ‘evaluation’ is ‘to seek out the value of;’ (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2007). It is hoped that by involving the various stakeholders in evaluating (determining the value the NSC has delivered to the LGBT community), successes will be enhanced, lessons learned, corrective action taken and greater accountability achieved through an improved future performance of the NSC.

This report answers questions about the NSC’s performance and effectiveness during the period 2013 to December 2016 under DPI hosting and fiscal sponsorship.

3. INTRODUCTION

This report presents findings of an evaluation exercise on the performance of NSC from 2013-2016 conducted by DPI with support from Fund for Global Human Rights (FGHR). The findings herein reflect opinions of members of the NSC, the LGBT community in Uganda and the Security Working Group (SWG) that resulted from an online survey and focus group discussions.

This report is divided into five parts;
1. The background of the evaluation that mainly describes the NSC,
2. Highlights the genesis of the committee, its membership, mandate, and relationship with other stakeholders,
3. Findings and Analysis,
4. Conclusion,
5. Recommendations.

The NSC is an informal social mechanism among the LGBT community in Uganda whose mandate is to offer emergency security support in the event of an attack based on prejudices to sexual orientation, gender identity, and expression. The established mandate of the NSC is to respond to security incidents involving LGBT persons in Uganda who are not covered by the mandates of other agencies that offer emergency security response.

In 2009, while at an East African LGBT regional seminar organized by The Norwegian LGBT Association (LLH) and Protection International, a Ugandan tabloid published a story alleging that a group of LGBT activists was being trained in Kenya to recruit more youth into the LGBT movement. During this seminar, both the organizers and participants discussed a mechanism to ensure the safe return of the Ugandan participants. The discussions also explored the implementation of preventive and reactionary security and safety measures for the LGBT community in Uganda. Consequently, an ad hoc committee led by David Kato (RIP)\(^1\) was constituted and later hosted by Akina Mama Wa Africa.

In 2011, after the untimely death of David Kato, the Security Committee was then led by Robert Karemire and hosted by the Refugee Law Project as the Chair of the Civil Society Coalition for Human Rights and Constitutional Law (CSCHRCL). However, Committee members lived in intense fear as media coverage of the events surrounding the death of David exposed the identity of many LGBT activists. Most of the Committee members fled the country to ‘safe havens’ leaving a vacuum in security management leadership of the LGBT community in Uganda.

November 2013, a period that was marred by feasible threats

\(^1\) http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-12295718
towards HRDs which were exacerbated by the enactment of Anti-Homosexuality Act (AHA) which was the most popular bill being discussed in parliament. This period was characterized by a rise of threats to the LGBT community which was compounded by the absence of an active security management framework. This prompted some of the community leaders to embark on a process geared at mitigating potential security threats.

For instance, Clare Byarugaba -then co-Coordinator of CSCHRCL hosted by Refugee Law Project in collaboration with DPI, organized a two-day seminar at Grand Global Hotel in Kampala geared at defining the strategic direction (to ascertain the relevancy, and revival) of NSC. This seminar brought together over 40 participants drawn from different organizations and parts of Uganda. The invitation of participants was cognizant of their SOGIE.

Additionally, Kasha Nabagesera –then Executive Director of Freedom and Roam Uganda (FARUG) called a meeting to revamp the security committee and in attendance were representatives from LGBT organizations in Kampala and upcountry. The participants reached a consensus of reviving the security committee with an emphasis on voluntarism, gender inclusiveness and regional representation through voting for positions.

The current Security Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organizational Affiliation</th>
<th>Security Committee Role + Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>FARUG</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>ICEBREAKERS UGANDA</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td>YOUTH ON THE ROCK FOUNDATION</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>QUEER YOUTHS UGANDA</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>SPECTRUM UGANDA INITIATIVE</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>RHFM</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>FARUG</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organizational Affiliation</td>
<td>Security Committee Role + Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Hope Mbale</td>
<td>Focal Person (Eastern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>Blessed Rwenzori</td>
<td>Focal Person (South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI</td>
<td>Fiscal Sponsor</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of NSC**

The purpose of the NSC is to provide emergency safety and protection support\(^2\) to LGBT Ugandans who are threatened due to their perceived sexual orientation and gender identity and expression.

**Mandate of the NSC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANDATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timely emergency response to LGBT security incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of security incidences reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and accountability to all stakeholders (fiscal sponsor, LGBT community and donors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up of security incidents that have been handled /reported to the NSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make referrals to appropriate stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In pursuit of their work, The NSC coordinates closely with the Security Working Group\(^3\) that comprises Defenders Protection Initiative (DPI), Human Rights Awareness and Promotion Forum (HRAPF), Defend Defenders and Sexual Minorities Uganda (SMUG).

---

2 This emergency support consists of referrals to partner providers of legal services, medical and psychosocial support, as well as the provision of temporary safe housing, longer term housing (i.e. 3 Months’ rent), safe transportation, and basic upkeep.

3 The interim Security working group is composed of the following members: Defenders Protection Initiative(DPI), Sexual Minority Uganda(SMUG), East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project(EHAHRDP), HRAPF and National Security Committee(NSC). SWG is chaired by DPI and serves as a forum to coordinate organizations in Uganda supporting the security and safety of individuals within the LGBT in Uganda with a focus on non-HRDs. The SWG also advises the National Security Committee on such cases that have been handled by member organizations to prevent duplication of assistance.
Fiscal Sponsorship

Aware of the hostile social and political climate at the time, DPI was nominated as the preferred fiscal sponsor and technical advisor of the new NSC due to its expertise in security management for HRDs.

Upon acceptance of the roles, DPI embarked on the process of inducting the NSC on its roles. This entailed conducting sessions on the rapid emergency response, communication strategies, security and safety, accountability, ethics and code of conduct of the NSC and mechanisms to receive, verify and respond to security incidents. Additionally, DPI assigned a staff member as a focal person for the NSC whose roles included; convening monthly meetings, preparing progress reports, fundraising and sharing security incidents.

4. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

To identify key achievements and challenges of the NSC.  
To assess the effectiveness of the NSC towards the LGBT security needs  
To provide recommendations on the performance NSC

5. METHODOLOGY

To carry out this evaluation, a mixed-mode method\(^4\) was used to assess the overall effectiveness of the NSC. This methodology included the use of document review, face to face interviews, data collection online survey and combined data analysis. This was done to provide a deeper revelation of the unanticipated results and also captures a wider range of perspectives that would not have been captured by a single method.

---

\(^4\) Mixed Mode refers to an emergent methodology of research that advances the systematic integration, or “mixing,” of quantitative and qualitative data within a single investigation or sustained program of inquiry.
Document Review
Documentation was reviewed primarily to inform an assessment of the relevance and performance of the committee. This included activity reports, minutes of meetings held by the NSC and SWG (details withheld for security reasons).

Data Collection
DPI employed both quantitative and qualitative methods of collecting data. A total of 120 members of the community were targeted. The mixed mode methodology included the use of document review, interviews, and online questionnaire method. Additionally, the confidentiality and anonymity that comes with online data collection were an added advantage.

Combined Data Analysis
Outputs from the document review, face to face interviews, data collection online survey, informed the data analysis process. This involved an iterative process of data immersion across the different sources and ensuring systematic attentions to the framework guiding the evaluation.

6. LIMITATIONS
There are several methodological limitations and considerations that should be noted. In light of these considerations, the evaluation was designed to use multiple lines of evidence (e.g., interviews, survey, and documentation) to strengthen the reliability and validity of the evaluation results.

- **Sample Representation:** The sample for the online survey of LGBT community did not include all LGBT members in Uganda.
- **Poor Response:** Few responses were registered (two out of seven) from the NSC online survey. In addition, some respondents did not complete the survey questionnaire in
its entirety.

- **Geographical access:** Majority of the respondents were residents of Kampala. As a result, the survey was not representative of the universe of the LGBT community in Uganda.

- **Familiarity with the tool:** Survey and interview respondents had varying degrees of familiarity with the online questionnaire and may not have represented all stakeholders.

- **Nature of the interview tool:** The online survey questionnaire did not allow further probing on the responses.

- **Limited access to the internet:** Some respondents didn’t have enough internet bandwidth and devices that could be used to complete the questionnaire leading to some misses in the questionnaires.

- **The length of the online questionnaire:** The length of the online questionnaire could have discouraged some respondents hence causing gaps in the data.

- **Limited English Literacy:** Some survey respondents could not comprehend the content of the online questionnaire due to variations in English literacy.

### 7. PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND FINDINGS

Below is the analysis of the findings from the survey that targeted 120 respondents. It is imperative to note that the survey team was privileged to receive 72% of the projected responses.
7.1.1 Knowledge about the NSC

Findings revealed that more than half (67.4%) of the respondents to the survey had heard of the NSC.

Figure 6.1: Heard about the NSC (%)

7.1.2 Role and functions of the NSC

The NSC was reported to be mainly known for providing security support (34.6%), helping the community members in need (18.5%) and providing Emergency Response (12.3%). However, (24.7%) did not know what the NSC does.

Figure 6.2: Functions of the NSC (%)
7. 1.3 How the LGBT community learns about the NSC

The findings revealed that the community learned about the NSC through various ways, but most of them learn through community activities (15), friends (9) and meetings and conferences (9) in the order.

Figure 6.3: Representation of how the community learns about the NSC

7. 1.4 Composition of the National Security Committee

Composition by names.

60.4% of the respondents to the survey knew about the composition of the NSC by names and persons. The responses provided for names or organizations but without tagging them to the gender and specific title or role on the committee. The organizations and terms mentioned are namely DPI, FARUG, LGBTI, and IBU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN, SW, DW, SO, MK and NK.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / No Response</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Composition by Organization

Most of the respondents could group the composition of the NSC by the organization. The respondents reported that FARUG (22) had the greatest number, followed by SMUG (16), LGBTI (10), and DPI followed by ICE BREAKERS (10), IBU (7) and lastly Spectrum and Queer Youth (6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FARUG</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE BREAKERS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBU</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum and Queer Youth</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUG</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. 1.5 Reaching out to the NSC in case of an Emergency

Over half (50) of the survey participants mentioned that they could reach NSC through the NSC-specific members, 28 could reach the NSC through other organization like DPI and EHAHRDP. Other respondents mentioned that they had specific contacts (phone and email) for some of the committee members, while others knew their physical addresses and 20 did not know any contact at all.
It was also reported by more than half (60.7%) that they do not know any LGBT and mainstream organizations that partner with the NSC.

7.1.6 Effectiveness of the partners in supporting the NSC

31 respondents recorded that they did not know the effectiveness of partners in supporting the NSC to execute its mandate. 18 of the respondents felt there was no effectiveness of the partners in supporting the NSC to follow its mandate. However, a few respondents managed to mention a case where they felt the partners had supported the NSC. This response was not clear, and this could be articulated to the way the question had been presented.

Table 6.1: Ways through which the Partners have been effective in supporting the NSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides support to the remote areas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide security training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide fundraising</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESPONSES & FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilitation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding the NSC accountable to any security concern</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to report and document the cases</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in voting of the NSC members</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide legal services (identifying lawyers) and legal referrals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on some incidents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide feedback on some LGBT ideas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide shelter for the LGBT officials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not as effective</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.1.7 Improvement of the NSC

The survey sought views on how to improve the effectiveness of NSC in responding to the security needs of the LGBT community. Two of every five (40.3%) of the respondents reported that the committee should be improved to represent all people to the lowest levels and 12.9% mentioned the need to establish transparent criteria to govern the procedures for selection and voting for members. A minority group suggested that all members of the community should be involved in all activities, the committee should also provide financial support and protection to members (see Table 6.2 below).
Table 6.2: Suggestions for improvement of the NSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Committee should include all representatives at all levels</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide financial support and protection to members</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve the community in all activities</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have clear and transparent criteria for selecting members and voting procedures</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve other organizations</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.8 Organizations that support the NSC

The respondents were in the know of organizations that support the NSC and their respective services provided as shown in Table 6.3 below:
Table 6.3: Organizations that support the NSC and respective support provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>SUPPORT SERVICE PROVIDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPI</td>
<td>Register cases, Fiscal Sponsor, Research and Documentation of cases, Organize workshops, Host NSC, Security Meetings and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRPAF</td>
<td>Provides legal services and assess cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East &amp; Horn</td>
<td>Provide Financial Services and emergency responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARUG</td>
<td>Research and Documentation of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECTRUM</td>
<td>Research and Documentation of cases, refer victims to the NSC, fundraise for NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUG</td>
<td>Research and Documentation of cases, offer security, fundraise, emergency responses and small funding to member organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer Youth Uganda</td>
<td>Secretariat for NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Breakers</td>
<td>Provides security in case of LGBT problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBU</td>
<td>Provide care and treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.9 Incident Support
The survey also sought to know how many of the participants had obtained support from the NSC. 63.5% of the respondents reported not to have obtained support while 36.5% reported having sought support from the NSC.

7.1.9.1 Type of support
The findings revealed the type of support required by the different participants in the LGBT community. Most of the respondents required housing support (48.8%), followed by medical care
(12.2%), legal aid (9.8%), psycho-social support (4.9%) followed by security management training and reference letters with the same percentage of 2.4 and other support required that was not specified was about 20% (see figure 3.1 below)

![Figure 6.5: Type of Support required from the NSC (%)]

7.1.9.2 Provision of support
The survey findings revealed that the NSC did not provide support to 67.7% while only 32.3% were provided with support.

7.1.9.3 Adequacy of the support
The survey also sought to know whether the respondents got adequate support from the NSC whereby most of the respondents’ support was inadequate (78.1%) and only 21.9% received adequate support.

7.1.9.4 Follow-up with the support and Duration of Support
The findings revealed that only 17% (9 respondents) of those who received support from the NSC were followed up. For those followed up by the NSC, the longest period of follow-up was three months for two respondents, ten days for one respondent, followed by a week for two respondents, one day for two respondents and the other two respondents did not need to be followed up.
7.1.9.5 Fund Support
Only 25.4% reported to have received support from the NSC after the occurrence of the security incident, and the funds were provided through various ways namely direct cash (65%) Mobile money transfer (15%) and other ways (20%).
Over 90% of those that received cash directly, the money was delivered by a known NSC member.

7.1.9.6 Accountability
Amongst those that received money, 29.8% signed a document acknowledging receipt. Only 15.9% of those that received money provided accountability for the funds advanced to them. However only a third of these accounted for the money using receipts. Of those that provided accountability using receipts, this was done in a period of one month. Amongst those that received funding, 12.2% faced some challenges in accounting for funds advanced to them. Amongst the challenges experienced were a lack of receipts from the service providers in the transport sector, food, and airtime.

7.1.9.7 Feedback Support
Amongst those that did not get support from the NSC after a security incident only 21.3% got feedback on why the support was not provided. For those that were provided with feedback on as to why support was denied, lack of funds was the major reason (21%) while others were referred to other organizations (20%) like Refugee Law Project, DPI, EHAHRDP and SMUG.

7.1.9.8 Survival Mechanism
The 26 respondents that provided input for this section, 6 sought help from friends, and 4 helped themselves, and 2 sought help from sister organizations while 14 responses were not applicable.
Table 6.5: Survival mechanisms of the LGBT members who did not get support from NSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVIVAL MECHANISM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends helped</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-help</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization support</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.10 Security Support

Findings from the evaluation survey revealed that more than 60% did not know the procedure for seeking support from the NSC. Furthermore, 90% of the respondents did not know the procedure and criteria for deciding which security incident(s) the NSC will support. At least more than half (55.1%) were in the know of other organizations that provide emergency security support in the event of a security incident. This means there is a need for proper written procedures for the functioning of the NSC activities. Findings revealed the following organizations listed in Table 6.6 as those that provide Emergency security support in the event of a security incident.

Table 6.6: Other organizations that provide emergency security support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEU</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHAHRD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST AND HORN OF AFRICA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRAPF</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONTLINE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGNITY FOR ALL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFEND DEFENDERS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.11 Perceptions about the NSC

The survey sought to find the perception about the NSC and its operations.

7.1.11.1 Security needs of the Community

The findings of the evaluation survey revealed that 35.8% agreed that the NSC is responsive to the security needs of the community, 33.3% were neutral while 31% disagreed.

Figure 6.6: Perception on how responsive NSC is to the security needs of the LGBT community
### 7.1.11.2 Response to security incidents

The findings of the evaluation survey revealed that 36% disagreed that the NSC did objectively respond to the security incidents reported by the LGBT members. However, 31.3% were neutral while 28% reported that the NSC responded objectively to the security incidents.

*Figure 6.7: Perception on how the NSC responds objectively to security incidents reported*

### 7.1.11.3 Timely response to security incidents

The findings revealed that 47% disagreed that the NSC responded to the security incidents promptly. However, 20% were neutral while 29% agreed that the NSC responded promptly to the security incidents.

*Figure 6.8: Perception on the timely response of the NSC*
7.1.11.4 Discrimination by the NSC

The findings revealed that 39.3% disagreed that the NSC was discriminative in responding to security incidents. However, 31% were neutral while 29.7% agreed that NSC was not discriminative.

![Figure 6.10: Perception on Confidentiality by the NSC](image)

7.1.11.5 Confidentiality of the NSC while handling cases

The survey revealed that 44% disagreed that the NSC was not handling security incidents with confidentiality. However, 22.5% were neutral while 33.3% agreed that there was a degree of confidentiality as shown in figure 6.10 below.

![Figure 6.10: Perception on Confidentiality by the NSC](image)

7.1.11.6 Feedback on Requests for support on Security Incidents

The survey findings revealed that 22.6% of the participants agreed that the NSC provided feedback on the requests for support on security incidents while 41.7% disagreed. However, 35.7% were neutral as shown in figure 6.11 below.
7.1.12 The NSC updates the community on its work

The survey revealed that 65.9% of the participants disagreed that the NSC provides updates on its work to the LGBT community. However, 16.5% agreed while 17.6% were neutral as shown in figure 6.12 below.

Figure 6.12: Perception on NSC updates

7.1.12.1 Knowledge about NSC and its mandate

The survey revealed that 66.7% of the participants disagreed that the LGBT Community in Uganda knows about the NSC and its mandate and 13.2% agreed while 19.6% were neutral as shown in figure 6.13 below.
7.1.12.2 The NSC can easily be reached for support in case of a security incident
The survey revealed that 39.3% of the participants disagreed that the NSC can easily be reached for support in case of a security incident and 29.8% agreed while 31% were neutral as shown in figure 6.14 below.

7.1.13 Suggestions to improve the quality of services offered.
The 62 respondents of this section suggested some ways through which the NSC can improve the quality services as indicated in figure 6.14
8. RESULTS FROM THE ONLINE NSC QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Below is the analysis of the findings from the survey that targeted seven (7) NSC members. Only two (2) members were in position to respond to the questionnaire. Notably, the NSC shared no success stories and suggestions for improvement as reflected in the questionnaire.

8.1 Composition and efficiency of the NSC

Positions on the NSC were filled through a democratic process expressed through nomination and seconding of candidates. On the issue of efficiency, one of the respondents believed that the composition of the NSC adequately addresses the needs of the community due to their experience with the LGBT while the other respondent felt that the NSC is inadequate due to poor planning, and failure to fulfill her mandate. Furthermore, both respondents agreed that the NSC`s capacity should be strategically enhanced and her members remunerated.
8.2 Work plan and evaluation of work done
The two respondents had different opinions on whether there is a clear framework for implementing the mandate of the committee. One of the respondents believed that the current work plan is incomplete while the other maintained that the current work plan is riddled with poor planning.

8.3 Contribution of partners of the NSC
The respondents were able to list partners of the NSC i.e. DPI, EHAHRDP, HRAPF, and SMUG and acknowledged their support and cooperation that included among others capacity development, legal aid, mobilization and technical support. The respondents also acknowledged diplomatic missions and other CSOs in supporting their mandate and the role of the Uganda Police while addressing some of the security incidents. The respondents suggested the need for more information, knowledge sharing and clearly defined channels of communication.

8.4 Cases Management: Support Requested: Evaluation of Cases
The two respondents had different opinions regarding the number of cases reported to NSC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases received</th>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Respondent 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest /Detention</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Eviction</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackmail and extortion</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequent to the security incidents, a number of LGBT community members requested for the following support: transport, legal aid, housing and psychosocial support, medical care, security management, reference letters, and food.

Cases supported
One of the respondent submitted that the total number of cases received, between 30 – 40% were supported.

Why some cases were not supported
The limited number of cases supported is as a result of insufficient evidence of the incident, inadequate funding to address the victim(s) and possible duplication of other support efforts by other partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASONS WHY CASES WERE NOT SUPPORTED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESPONDENT 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Evidence</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funds</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Human Resource</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of support</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5 Procedure for evaluating requests for assistance
Respondents argued that the NSC convenes and assesses support requests. However, there are conflicting views on whether the procedure for evaluating requests is clearly documented or not. Both respondents agree that the NSC has sensitized the community on the procedure of evaluating requests through workshops and onsite visits.

“The NSC submits that all support requests are evaluated based on credibility, urgency, and availability of funds” by one of the respondents.
8.6 Costs to review requests for assistance

One of the respondents submitted the total cost being one hundred thousand shillings (100,000shs) and that the cost is met by the NSC, DPI or DefendDefenders.

8.7 Post Support Follow Up

Both respondents submitted that the NSC gives cash as part of the support and follows up on the support given, one respondent argued that on average the NSC follows up beneficiaries for a month after giving support. However both respondents didn’t know the total value of sums advanced to the NSC beneficiaries.

8.8 Accountability of all funds by beneficiaries

Only one respondent revealed that the beneficiaries did not account for the funds while the other did not respond to the question, additionally both respondents had no knowledge on how much funds were not accounted for. It was revealed that psycho-social support was the least support accounted for.

8.9 Denial of Support Requests

One respondents agreed that feedback is always given to unsuccessful applications mainly over the phone. They however, note that such information is usually received negatively. One respondent asserts that the NSC follows up unsuccessful applicants to ascertain how they fared after the security incident for which support was sought, during which they found out that such applicants explore other sources of support.
8.10 Perceptions of the work of the National Security Committee

An average of the scores of the respondents was generated to produce a single representative value to depict the summative perception. The scale shows the average responses categorized into; Strongly Agree (1); Agree (2); Neutral (3); Disagree (4); Strongly Disagree

9. SUCCESS STORIES

The online survey provided for additional comments from the respondents and the following were extracted;
» Successful relocations in incidents where physical violence has been registered.
» NSC has learned to be efficient and timely in responding and investigating cases before acting upon them.
» “As a Security Focal Person, I have referred cases to the committee, and the beneficiaries have been assisted timely.”
» The NSC has strengthened a culture that values and empowers the LGBT members to work together and solve problems as a team.
» NSC has been able to provide funding to some of the LGBT community members.
» “I got funds and was relocated, but it took a lot of time for me to get to a secure place due to the delay of disbursement of funds.”
» Members like KN are committed to providing emergency support when called upon.
10. TESTIMONIALS

“The questionnaire is very interesting, and appreciation goes to DPI that created awareness of the NSC. Frank and Candy Uganda would love to know more about the National Security Committee.”

“I liked the use of the online questionnaire I believe it’s one way the members will be able to give extra confidential information” ....NSC member

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is important to note that the recommendations below are drawn from the online survey and DPI’s direct engagement with the NSC for the last three(3) years.

A. Responding to cases.

- Response to security incidents should be conducted in a neutral and objective manner based on facts rather than the past behavior of the victim. Emergency response of such nature should be made under the principle of ‘save life first’. However, at the analysis level and on a case by case basis, past engagements should be highlighted, balancing encouragement with caution and emphasizing that security begins with the individual.

- There is a need for the NSC to communicate to the LGBT community regularly and clearly on its mandate and capacities, to avoid unrealistic expectations and frustrations from their beneficiaries.

- Gender sensitivity should be considered at all levels. Gender Integration should be prioritized in the composition of the NSC, response and actual support extended to the LGBT community in Uganda.
B. Confidentiality and Security

- There is a need for NSC members to appreciate the importance of confidentiality. It’s crucial to fully understand the likely physical security risks, including the psychological impact of actions that compromise confidentiality during emergency response. All members of the committee should sign an oath of allegiance and confidentiality to serve on the committee and should be held accountable for any breaches.
- NSC should ensure the safety and security of victims within her mandate at all times. The committee should devise security plans and strategies to protect the victim’s identity.
- There is need to compile and disseminate to the LGBT community a referral directory of relevant service providers identified by the NSC.
- NSC needs to establish rapport and enter partnership agreements with various service providers /stakeholders to ameliorate emergency response efficiency and effectiveness.

C. Support and Accountability

- Despite the NSC membership being voluntary, there is need to cover some form of incentive to motivate them to afford more time to respond to security incidents.
- The NSC needs to establish proper procedures for providing financial support to the LGBT communities and their respective appropriate accountability procedures.
- There is need to design a constitution that shall define and guide the operations of the NSC. The constitution ought to define the structure of NSC (how a member joins and leaves), lines of accountability, the tenure of office among others.
- NSC should be provided with regular capacity building opportunities to expand their range of experience in effective case management and administration.
- Regular reviews on the work of the NSC should be conducted to facilitate reflection on challenges and areas of improvement for effective performance.
D. Structure and Communication

- The NSC membership should be inclusive considering SOGIE and geographical representation which will enhance a countrywide LGBT response infrastructure.
- The NSC structure should be realigned to include a Communication Officer to improve communication and dissemination of information to the NSC and the LGBT community members and other stakeholders.
- The NSC should consider making use of other existing response structures e.g. Security Focal Persons (SFPs), paralegals and Coalitions.
- Improve accessibility of beneficiaries to the NSC; this calls for a known email address, phone number, and toll-free line.

*Figure 1: A graph showing average scores on how the NSC perceives its work*
ANNEX 1:
Income and expenditure Report:
March 2014- July 2016
# Income and expenditure Report: March 2014- July 2016 (Revenue per source in UGX)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FUNDRAISING DRIVE BY KASHA</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL HIV/AIDS ALLIANCE</th>
<th>UKCON</th>
<th>KDA</th>
<th>FGHR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>28,342,660/=</td>
<td>24,800,000/=</td>
<td>3,980,000/=</td>
<td>430,000/=</td>
<td>39,235,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings and Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,875,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,450,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,475,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Costs Internet &amp; Airtime</td>
<td>1,350,000/=</td>
<td>700,000/=</td>
<td>430,000/=</td>
<td>2,031,575/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Assessment Costs</td>
<td>1,800,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up of cases- Court costs</td>
<td>610,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshments during monthly meetings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,559,425/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport refunds for monthly meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,888,600/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC Internal Review Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,391,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation and case investigation costs</td>
<td>13,505,000/=</td>
<td>1,850,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,765,475/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery costs</td>
<td>120,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,652,500/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Travel costs</td>
<td>600,000/=</td>
<td>342,000 /=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Allowance</td>
<td>4,950,000/=</td>
<td>540,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI Administration Costs 10 % of the Gross income</td>
<td>2,834,266/=</td>
<td>5,000,000/=</td>
<td>398,000/=</td>
<td>2,327,500/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>27,842,660 /=</td>
<td>24,800,000/=</td>
<td>3,980,000/=</td>
<td>430,000/=</td>
<td>34,616,575/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available Balance</strong></td>
<td>500,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,618,425/=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2:
NSC Review Questionnaires for the LGBT Community
NSC Review Questionnaire for the LGBT Community

Defenders’ Protection Initiative (DPI) is conducting a review of the activities of the National LGBT Security Committee (NSC) for the year ending 30th November 2016.

This is a self administered questionnaire to inform the review. You are kindly asked to fill the questionnaire frankly and submit it. All information collected is confidential and will only be used to assess the work done by the NSC and help in drawing strategies for improving the services offered by the Committee.

Kindly fill the form and submit it immediately. Thank you.

*Required

1. Have you heard of the National LGBTI Security Committee (NSC)? *
   
   Mark only one oval.
   
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

2. What does the NSC do?

3. How did you learn about the NSC?

4. Do you know the composition of the NSC in terms of gender, organisations and persons?
   
   Mark only one oval.
   
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No
5. If YES, who sits on the NSC?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

6. When and how was the current NSC composed?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

7. Do you feel that the NSC is representative of the LGBT community and its security needs?
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No

8. If NO, how can the NSC’s membership be improved to represent the security interests of the LGBT community?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

9. How can you reach the NSC in case of an emergency?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. If YES, kindly list one of the phone number, email or physical address by which you can reach the NSC

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
11. Do you know any LGBT and mainstream organisations that partner with the NSC?
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

12. If YES, please list them

13. How does each of the organisations listed above support the NSC?

14. How effective have the partners been in supporting the NSC to execute its mandate?

15. List suggestions of how each of the partners can be more effective in supporting the NSC

16. Can you suggest other organisations that can support the NSC?
NSC Review Questionnaire for the LGBT Community

Incident Support
This section seeks to know how effective the NSC has been in providing support to the LGBT community in the event of a security incident such as assault, arrest, rape, illegal eviction, etc on account of their sexual orientation or gender identity

17. Have you ever sought support from the NSC?
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No

18. What kind of support did you require?
Mark only one oval.

☐ Housing
☐ Transport
☐ Legal aid
☐ Medical care
☐ Psycho-social support
☐ Security management training/advice
☐ Reference letter
☐ Food
☐ Other: ____________________________

19. Did the NSC provide support to you?
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No

20. If YES, was the support adequate?
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No

21. Did the NSC make any follow up to your situation after support was given
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No

22. How long was the follow up?

______________________________
23. **What kind of follow up was it?**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Visiting you at secure new location
   - [ ] Checking on your health status
   - [ ] Securing your police bond
   - [ ] Following up the court cases
   - [ ] Other: ____________________________

24. **Were any funds advanced to you to support you in your security incident?**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

25. **If YES, how did the finds reach you?**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Mobile money transfer
   - [ ] Cash delivered by hand
   - [ ] Other: ____________________________

26. **If you received cash by hand, who delivered the money?**

27. **Did you have to sign a document acknowledging receipt of the money?**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

28. **Did you provide accountability for the funds advanced to you**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

29. **If YES, how did you account for the money?**

   ____________________________

   ____________________________

   ____________________________

   ____________________________
30. How long after receipt of the funds did you account for the money?

31. Are there any specific circumstances where you face a challenge accounting for funds advanced to you?
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

32. If YES, please list them and why it is difficult to account for funds in these circumstances?

33. If the NSC did not provide support to your application for support during and after a security incident, did you get feedback on why the support was not given?
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

34. If feedback was given, what was the reason support was denied?

35. How did you survive through the security incident when the support was denied?

36. Did the NSC make any follow up to your situation after support was denied?
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
37. **Do you know the procedure for seeking support from the NSC?**
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   ○ Yes
   
   ○ No

38. **Do you know the procedure and criteria for deciding which security incident the NSC will support?**
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   ○ Yes
   
   ○ No

39. **Do you know of any other organisations that provide emergency security support in the event of a security incident?**
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   ○ Yes
   
   ○ No

40. **If YES, kindly list them.**

   
   __________________________________________
   
   __________________________________________
   
   __________________________________________

**Perceptions about the NSC**

This section seeks to obtain the respondent's perception of the NSC on a few aspects. Kindly select on the scale 1 - 5, if you Strongly Agree - 1, Agree - 2, Neutral - 3, Disagree - 4 or Strongly Disagree - 5 with the statement.

41. **The NSC is responsive to the security needs of the community**
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   1 2 3 4 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. **The NSC responds objectively to security incidents reported to it**
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   1 2 3 4 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
43. The NSC responds in a timely manner to security incidents
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

44. The NSC does not discriminate in responding to security incidents
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

45. The NSC handles security incident requests confidentially.
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

46. The NSC gives feedback to requests for support to security incidents
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

47. The NSC acts on security incidents before they are reported to it.
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

48. The NSC regularly updates the LGBT community on the work it does
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

49. All LGBT members submit honest requests for help to security incidents
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree
50. **The NSC regularly updates the community of security risks and remedies**  
*Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. **The LGBTI community in Uganda knows about the NSC and its mandate**  
*Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. **The NSC can easily be reached for support in the case of a security incident**  
*Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. **Please make any suggestions on what can be done to improve the quality of service being offered by the NSC in providing security and responding to security incidents in the community**

54. **Please share any success stories and or achievements that you have experienced from the services offered by the NSC**

5/23/2017 NSC Review Questionnaire for the LGBT Community
ANNEX 3:
NSC Review Questionnaires for Committee Members
Defenders’ Protection Initiative (DPI) is conducting a review of the activities of the National LGBT Security Committee (NSC) for the year ending 30th November 2016.

This is a self administered questionnaire to inform the review. You are kindly asked to fill the questionnaire frankly and submit it. All information collected is confidential and will only be used to assess the work done by the NSC and help in drawing strategies for improving the services offered by the Committee.

Kindly fill the form and submit immediately. Thank you.

*Required

1. What criteria was used in composing the membership of the NSC? *

2. Is the composition of the membership of the NSC adequate in addressing the security needs of the community? *

   Mark only one oval.

   □ Yes
   □ No

3. If YES, why do you think that the composition of the NSC is adequate?
4. If NO, why do you think that the composition of the NSC is inadequate


5. How can the membership of the NSC be enhanced to meet the security needs of the community?


6. Does the NSC have a work plan for its activities? *
   
   Mark only one oval.

   □ Yes
   □ No

7. If YES, what duration does the work plan cover?
   
   Mark only one oval.

   □ 3 months
   □ 6 months
   □ 1 year
   □ 2 years
   □ 3 years
   □ More than 3 years

8. How much of the work plan has been accomplished (%)?
   
   Mark only one oval.

   □ Less than 20%
   □ Between 20% and 30%
   □ Between 31% and 50%
   □ Between 51% and 75%
   □ More than 75%
9. **What has hindered accomplishment of the work plan?**

10. **If the NSC does not have a work plan, what has stopped the committee from developing a work plan?**

11. **Are regular meetings held to evaluate work done by the NSC?**
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

12. **How frequently are the evaluation meetings held?**
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   - [ ] Ad hoc (as and when there is need)
   - [ ] Weekly
   - [ ] After 2 weeks
   - [ ] Monthly
   - [ ] Quarterly
   - [ ] Twice a year
   - [ ] Annually
   - [ ] Other: 

13. **What partner organisations work with the NSC?**
14. How does each of the organisations listed above support the NSC?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

15. How effective have the partners been in supporting the NSC to execute its mandate?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

16. List suggestions of how each of the partners can be more effective in supporting the NSC

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

17. Can you suggest other organisations that can support the NSC?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

18. Do you know of any other organisations that support the community in the event of a security incident?  
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes

☐ No

19. If YES, please list them.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
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20. **Is there any form of cooperation between the NSC and these organisations?**
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

21. **If YES, what form of cooperation does NSC have with these organisations?**

---

**Case Management**

This section seeks to know how the NSC has been handling security incidents/cases and its effectiveness in providing support to the LGBT community in the event of a security incident such as assault, arrest, rape, illegal eviction, etc on account of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

22. **How many cases/incidents were reported to the NSC during the period/year from July 2015 to June 2016?**

---

23. **Of the reported cases how many of them involved assault?**

---

24. **Of the reported cases how many of them involved rape?**

---

25. **Of the reported cases how many of them involved illegal arrest/detention?**

---

26. **Of the reported cases how many of them involved illegal eviction?**

---

27. **Of the reported cases how many of them involved verbal abuse?**

---

28. **Of the reported cases how many of them involved blackmail and extortion?**

---
29. What kind of support was requested when these cases were reported?  
Tick all that apply.

- Housing
- Transport
- Legal aid
- Medical care
- Psycho-social support
- Security management training/advice
- Reference letter
- Food
- Other: 

30. How many of these cases were addressed/supported by the NSC?

31. Why were some of these cases not addressed/supported?  
Tick all that apply.

- Insufficient evidence of the incident
- Inadequate funding to address/support the victim
- Inadequate human resources available to the NSC to address/support the victim
- Duplication of support efforts
- Other: 

32. How many of these cases were not addressed because of insufficient evidence of a security incident?

33. How many of these cases were not addressed because of inadequate funds to address/support the victim?

34. How many of these cases were not addressed because the NSC did not have enough human resource to deal with the case?

35. How many of these cases were not addressed because it was discovered that there was duplication of support efforts?
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36. **How many of these cases were not addressed because of other reasons?**

37. **What is the procedure for evaluating requests for assistance?**

38. **Is the procedure for evaluating requests for assistance documented?**
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

39. **Has the NSC sensitised the community on the procedure for evaluating requests for assistance?**
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

40. **When and how has the NSC sensitised the community on the procedure for evaluating requests for assistance?**

41. **If the NSC has not sensitised the community on the procedure for evaluating requests for assistance, are there any specific reasons? Please state them**
42. What criteria is followed to determine which requests shall be provided with or denied assistance?

43. What is the average cost of reviewing and evaluating a request for assistance?

44. Who meets the cost of reviewing and evaluating a request for assistance?

45. What is the total cost for reviewing and evaluating requests for the year ending December 2016?

46. Does the NSC follow up on the support given to beneficiaries?
   Mark only one oval.
   Yes
   No

47. On average, for how long does the NSC follow up beneficiaries of its support?

48. Were any funds advanced to the beneficiaries as part of the support?
   Mark only one oval.
   Yes
   No

49. What was the total value of the sums advanced?

50. Did all the beneficiaries account for all funds advanced to them?
   Mark only one oval.
   Yes
   No
51. If NO, how much of the funds advanced (in Uganda Shillings) were not accounted for?

__________________________________________________________

52. In how many cases have beneficiaries failed to account for funds advanced to them?

__________________________________________________________

53. What categories of accountability are least accounted for?

Mark only one oval.
- Transport
- Temporary shelter
- Legal support
- Psycho-social support
- Meals
- Other:

__________________________________________________________

54. Was feedback given to unsuccessful applications for support?

Mark only one oval.
- Yes, always
- Sometimes
- Never

55. If YES or SOMETIMES, how was the feedback given?

Mark only one oval.
- In person
- Over phone
- By email
- Other:

__________________________________________________________

56. How did the unsuccessful applicants respond to the negative feedback?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
57. Did the NSC follow up on the unsuccessful applicants to establish how they fared after the security incidents?
Mark only one oval.

- Yes, always
- Sometimes
- Never

58. If YES or SOMETIMES, what did the unsuccessful applicants do to survive after the security incident?
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

Perceptions about the NSC
This section seeks to obtain the respondent's perception of the NSC on a few aspects. Kindly select on the scale 1 - 5, if you Strongly Agree - 1, Agree - 2, Neutral - 3, Disagree - 4 or Strongly Disagree - 5 with the statement.

59. The NSC is responsive to the security needs of the community
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

60. The NSC responds objectively to security incidents reported to it
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

61. The NSC responds appropriately to security incidents reported to it
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree

62. The NSC responds in a timely manner to security incidents
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree
63. The NSC responds appropriately to security incidents reported to it
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. The NSC does not discriminate in responding to security incidents
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65. The NSC handles security incident requests confidentially.
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. The NSC gives feedback to requests for support to security incidents
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. The NSC acts on security incidents before they are reported to it.
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. The NSC is accountable to the community it serves
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. All LGBT members submit honest requests for help to security incidents
Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
70. The NSC regularly updates the community of security risks and remedies
   *Mark only one oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

71. The LGBTI community in Uganda knows about the NSC and its mandate
   *Mark only one oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

72. The NSC can easily be reached for support in the case of a security incident
   *Mark only one oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly Disagree

73. Please make any suggestions on what can be done to improve the quality of service being
offered by the NSC in providing security and responding to security incidents in the community

   
   
   
   
   

74. Please share any success stories and or achievements that you have experienced from the
services offered by the NSC

   
   
   
   
   
