

Logistical Framework

Narrative Summary	Verifiable Indicators	Targets	Means of Verification
GOAL			
<p>G.1 Governments are more accountable and improve their SRHR programs and services for all people, particularly the poor, marginalized and underserved</p>	<p>G.1 MDG 5 Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maternal mortality ratio b. Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel c. Contraceptive prevalence rate d. Adolescent birth rate e. Antenatal care coverage (at least one visit and at least four visits) f. Unmet need for family planning <p>G.2 Number and type of favorable decisions made by governments related to increased access to SRHR, by year</p> <p>G.3 Degree of government accountability at beginning, middle, and end of project</p>	<p>G.1 MDG 5 Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reduce by $\frac{3}{4}$ by 2015 b. Reduce by $\frac{3}{4}$ by 2015 c. Universal access by 2015 d. Universal access by 2015 e. Universal access by 2015 f. Universal access by 2015 <p>G.2 2 favorable decisions in each country by 2013</p> <p>G.3 10% increase of government accountability by 2013</p>	<p>G.1 MDG 5 progress reports</p> <p>G.1 HDI reports</p> <p>G.1 WHO reports</p> <p>G.2 MA End-of-Year reports</p> <p>G.2 MA "Success Story" narratives</p> <p>G.2 MA media tracking forms</p> <p>G.3 Open Budget Index (created by the International Budget Project)</p> <p>G.3 Transparency International</p>
PURPOSE			
<p>P.1 To increase the capacity of CSO to help citizens effectively represent their views and interests and hold governments accountable for their actions with regard to SRHR, specifically MDG 5, at different levels</p>	<p>P.1 Existence of new and/or revamped permanent bodies/processes related with meaningful CSO participation that can hold governments accountable, by year (yes, no)</p>	<p>P.1 1-2 new and/or revamped permanent bodies/processes in each country by 2013</p>	<p>P.1 Political Maps</p> <p>P.1 Mid-Year Reflection reports</p> <p>P.1 MA "Success Story" narratives</p> <p>P.1 Shadow reports</p> <p>P.1 MDG progress reports, where applicable</p>

Narrative Summary	Verifiable Indicators	Targets	Means of Verification
in the governmental system			
OUTPUT #1			
<p>1. Improved ability of CSO networks and coalitions centered around SRHR policy change to demand government accountability.</p>	<p>1.1 Advocacy network(s) participate in key policy making processes and fora demanding government accountability, at beginning, middle, and end of project (yes, no)</p> <p>1.2 Number and type of political decisions related to SRH made by governments in participating countries where the CSO network was involved in the decision-making process, by year</p> <p>1.3 Perceptions of key network members regarding how well network functions (including synergy of aims, trust, and unity), at middle, and end of project</p> <p>1.4 Number and detailed information of allies in target and secondary audiences identified during political mapping process, by relative strength of their commitment (strong ally, somewhat strong, potential ally), by year</p> <p>1.5 Number of networks/coalitions created or strengthened to work on SRH policy/budget, by type of network and by year</p>	<p>1.1 Yes, by 2013</p> <p>1.2 2 decisions in each country by 2013</p> <p>1.3 Perceptions of at least 50% of key network members improve at middle and end of project</p> <p>1.4 At least 1 ally each year strengthens commitment in each country</p> <p>1.5 At least 1 network by middle of project</p>	<p>1.1 Political Mapping</p> <p>1.1 MA End-of-Year project reports</p> <p>1.2 MA End-of-Year project reports</p> <p>1.2 MA "Success Story" narratives</p> <p>1.2 MA "Intense Period Debrief" narratives</p> <p>1.3 Mid-Term Review</p> <p>1.3 Final Evaluation</p> <p>1.4 Political Maps (Audience Analysis and Map of Actors)</p> <p>1.4 Mid-Year Reflection reports</p> <p>1.5 MA End-of-Year project reports</p> <p>1.5 Political Maps</p> <p>1.5 Mid-Year Reflection reports</p>

Narrative Summary	Verifiable Indicators	Targets	Means of Verification
OUTPUT #2			
<p>2. Improved public policy around sexual and reproductive health and rights, through increasing the capacity of IPPF MAs from the Western Hemisphere Region and European Network to play a proactive role with other civil society organizations.</p>	<p>2.1 Number and percent of participating MAs that achieve their specific Expected Advocacy Results during the life of the project, by year</p> <p>2.2 Number and percent of participating MAs that develop and maintain updated political maps, by year</p> <p>2.3 Number of staff/volunteers in MAs that have stronger advocacy skills, by year</p> <p>2.4 Number of new MA strengths, or weaknesses turned into strengths, in implementing advocacy strategies, by year</p>	<p>2.1 100% of participating MAs achieve their specific Expected Advocacy Result by 2013</p> <p>2.2 100% of MAs maintain updated political maps each year</p> <p>2.3 90% of MA staff/volunteers continuously involved in the implementation of the project have stronger advocacy skills by 2013</p> <p>2.4 At least 1 new strength and 1 weakness turned into a strength each year for each MA</p>	<p>2.1 MA End-of-Year project reports</p> <p>2.1 Advocacy Plans</p> <p>2.1 MA “Success Story” narratives</p> <p>2.1 RO project records (including assessments at the end of project)</p> <p>2.2 RO project records (including assessment of quality and quantity of updates to political maps)</p> <p>2.2 Mid-Year Reflection reports</p> <p>2.3 RO project records (including assessment of advocacy skills in MAs)</p> <p>2.3 MA staffs’ “My Role” narratives</p> <p>2.3 MA End-of-Year project reports</p> <p>2.4 SWOT analysis conducted during Advocacy Planning Workshop</p> <p>2.4 Mid-Year Reflection reports</p>
OUTPUT #3			
<p>3. Increased capacity of the IPPF WHR and EN regional offices (ROs) to provide high-quality, timely technical assistance</p>	<p>3.1 Lessons learned by MAs and RO in planning and conducting advocacy campaigns, by year</p>	<p>3.1 At least 1 substantive MA and 1 substantive RO lesson learned each year</p>	<p>3.1 RO team assessment</p> <p>3.1 MA End-of-Year project reports</p> <p>3.1 MA “Success Story” narratives</p> <p>3.1 MA “Intense Period Debrief” narratives</p>

Narrative Summary	Verifiable Indicators	Targets	Means of Verification
<p>specific to advocacy around governmental accountability related to SRHR issues and poverty reduction and to disseminate best practices and lessons learned.</p>	<p>3.2 Model methodology for conducting advocacy projects for use with MAs developed and tested</p> <p>3.3 Perceptions of “key stakeholders” with respect to the quality and utility of the model methodology, at middle and end of project</p>	<p>3.2 Model methodology developed and tested by year 1 of project</p> <p>3.3 Perceptions of at least a 50% of key network members improve at middle and end of project</p>	<p>3.2 Existence of the model methodology at the end of year 1</p> <p>3.2 RO project records detailing the results of testing</p> <p>3.3 Mid-Term Review</p> <p>3.3 Final Evaluation</p>
<p>Key Activities</p>			

Output #1

- 1.1 Work with MAs to facilitate the creation or strengthening of national networks that include MAs, CSOs, academics, and other relevant actors.
- 1.2 Assisting networks in approaching and conducting advocacy with targeted decision-makers
- 1.3 Assisting networks in their efforts to act as watchdogs on budgetary issues and international laws/policies.
- 1.4 Making linkages between SRHR movement and other relevant social movements (e.g. human rights, environment, indigenous).

Output #2

- 2.1 Assisting MAs in developing advocacy plans using models designed for the project.
- 2.2 Working with MAs to create and update political maps, and to define and analyze the specific issue on which it would be most strategic to conduct advocacy.
- 2.3 Providing technical assistance and resources to strengthen advocacy skills via workshops, trainings and advocacy toolkits.
- 2.4 Assessments of the specific capacity and the needs of each participating MA.

Output #3

- 3.1 Developing an expertise in transparency, accountability and advocacy in the Regional Offices.
- 3.2 Developing and testing a model methodology for conducting Advocacy projects.
- 3.3 Developing and testing a strong approach to evaluating our political advocacy work.
- 3.4 Systematizing cross-regional sharing and learning.