

DFID NIGERIA: STATE LEVEL PROGRAMMES (SLPs)

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PROVIDER FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Introduction

1. DFID Nigeria wishes to appoint an independent external provider (the Service Provider) to monitor progress with, and evaluate the achievements of, an integrated suite of four New State Level Programmes (SLP or 'the Programmes'). The Programmes are being introduced in 2008 to support the Federal Government of Nigeria and 5¹ State Governments from 2008 to 2014.

2. The Programmes are:

State Partnership for Accountability Responsiveness Capability (SPARC) which will support strengthening of governance arrangements at state level and enhance efficiency and effectiveness in the use of public resources. By working at state level on policy development, public financial management and public service reform in central ministries, and at Federal level by working to increase incentives for states to improve on governance.

State Accountability and Voice Initiative (SAVI) which is a separately managed component of SPARC which will support up to 8 states and their local governments to improve their responsiveness and accountability in the delivery of pro-poor services through working on support to policy advocacy, research, and State Houses of Assembly.

Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN), designed to improve planning, financing, management and delivery of basic education services;

Partnership for Transforming Health Systems (PATHS 2) designed to improve financing, management and delivery of sustainable and replicable pro-poor health services.

Growth & Employment in States (GEMS), which is still at the design stage, and will not be operational until late 2009 at the earliest.

3. As part of the programmes' design, draft logical frameworks (logframes) were prepared. Copies of the logframes are included at Annex A. During the Inception Phase each programme consultancy team is agreeing revised programme logical frameworks and nested programme logframes, as well as work plans monitorable at output and outcome (as well as activity) level, for each state. As part of this exercise, OVs and MoVs will be defined together with the essential baseline information that is required. Support from an experienced logframe practitioner is being provided to all programme teams to assist with defining the key indicators, identifying the means and sources of data and the identification of the key baselines.

¹ This initial number may increase to as many as 8 during the life of the SLP, commencing from year 3. The Service Providers should provisionally cost for the additional three states.

4. In addition to the programme-wide and individual state level logframes, DFID will agree a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with each of the state governments at the outset of their engagement. The purpose of these MoUs is to set out the partnership arrangements and respective undertakings. They will be underpinned by a selection of key performance indicators, derived in part from the logframes but also informed by the State Governance and Fiduciary Risk Assessments. Performance against the MoUs will be assessed annually. As of November 2008, one state has signed an MoU with DFID, but MoUs for the other states are still to be concluded.

Objectives

5. The objectives of this consultancy are as follows:

- *To design a system to monitor and evaluate the success of the Programmes (SPARC, SAVI, ESSPIN, PATHS2 and potentially GEMS), in achieving the intended outputs², purposes and goals as defined in the programme logical frameworks (including making recommendations to improvements of logframes and potentially working with the Programmes to develop combined State level logical frameworks). The intended outcomes and impact need to be elaborated as part of the design process.*
- *To implement the recommended M&E system covering both individual state performance and national performance. Implementation will involve the gathering of essential data from existing or new sources, the commissioning of analytical work (through studies and surveys) and the synthesis of the data and its presentation of routine performance reports³ to DFID, state governments and national authorities. As much as possible, the M&E system should draw on government sources. It should be designed so as to develop government capability to do its own M&E. It should be integrated as far as possible with the proposed government-led annual reviews of progress, for example in the health and education sectors.*
- *To monitor and report on the risks facing successful implementation, as part of the M&E system; to propose revised mitigation strategies, if needed*

² Implementing service providers for the suite of programmes have proposed varying levels of involvement in programme monitoring and evaluation in their technical proposals. All will be responsible for monitoring inputs and activities and where necessary the M&E Service Provider will draw on this information to supplement reporting at output level.

³ The initial expectation, subject to the recommendations of the detailed design, is a number of M&E reports at state and SLP programme-wide levels that inform the work of the relevant steering committees in each state, the DFID annual review process of the 4 programmes, including OPRs, and the annual assessment of MoU implementation in each state. All of these assessments and reports will be synthesised into a single report to help inform DFID's monitoring of its implementation of its Country Assistance Strategy and feedback to FGN.

- To undertake thematic or issues based studies, to help inform and facilitate the achievements' of the SLP outputs, purpose, outcomes and impact
- *To ensure synergy between M&E of the Programmes;* including information sharing and dissemination of findings

Scope of Work

6. In respect of the logframe structure and content, the Service Provider will be responsible for reporting on the following areas in both state level and SLP logframes:

- Output level indicators to the extent that these are outside the responsibility of the programme consultants. Where individual programme consultants are helping to strengthen management information systems within their respective organisations or institutional environment (for example, such as EMIS, HMIS and IFMIS), they will be responsible for gathering the data and completing the analysis in respect of the relevant OVIs. Where OVIs at an Output level require 'independent' quantification through special studies and surveys, the Service Provider will be responsible for carrying out this work. The exact scope of this will be agreed in consultation with DFID and the programme consultants.
- Output to Purpose assumptions and their current status
- Purpose level indicators and progress towards their achievement
- Purpose to Goal level assumptions and their current status
- Goal level indicators and progress towards their achievement

7. As far as possible (given existing government capacity gaps), the M&E design should use, build on, and seek to develop, government information and statistical services. Likewise, as far as possible it should be based on indicators prioritised by Federal and State governments – potentially assisting government in setting such indicators where current indicators are not yielding needed information.

Tasks related to the design of the M&E system

8. By reference to the logical frameworks/workplans prepared by the programme consultants at National level and for each state, and to Federal and State governments own plans the Service Provider will:

- Verify that the OVIs are appropriate and that it will be feasible and cost effective to collect the necessary data through the specified means of verification.

- If necessary, propose alternative OVIs which can be measured more readily.
 - Determine which OVIs at Output level will be the responsibility of the programme consultant to verify.
 - Propose how the assumptions can be monitored, and reported on, in a practical way.
 - Potentially develop an over-arching logframe for the suite of programmes against which progress and risks can be monitored.
 - Design the M&E approach in order to maximise its utility for supporting sector wide programming (harmonised with other donors) and more effective aid.
9. Propose the methodologies for measuring outcomes and carrying out impact assessments based on proposals for appropriate OVIs in addition to those included already in the logframes.
10. Confirm that, where MoUs include additional performance indicators beyond those included in logframes, the means of verification are feasible
11. Confirm the selection of the baselines and verify that, where data collection is dependent on state level and national statistical information systems, the information is or can be made readily available in the format and at the frequency required. Where there are gaps in government statistical systems, the Service Provider will propose how these might be filled on a timely and cost effective manner while at the same time building government capacity as far as possible.
12. Assess the extent to which the SLPs Knowledge Management System⁴ will provide a source of information and analysis which can be utilised by the Programmes' Nigerian partners (government or non-government) as well as DFID.
13. Propose the nature and extent of any participatory M&E approaches that will help strengthen the involvement of Nigerian civil society in programme delivery (this element should not necessarily be limited to the SAVI programme).
14. Be cognisant of the M&E requirements adopted by other development partners for their complementary programmes (for example, World Bank and SESP which is closely linked to ESSPIN).

⁴ The programme consultants have each made proposals on knowledge management, these will need to be harmonised at the beginning of inception phase, probably under the leadership of the SPARC programme, to form a common Knowledge Management System.

15. Design the appropriate reporting timetable, and report formats, for the monitoring and evaluation system. Account will be taken of the existing business reporting cycles both in governments (financial and plan preparation timetables) and in DFID (in year programme reporting).

16. Prepare a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation manual to guide the M&E system implementation. The Manual will:

- Outline the overall 'architecture' of the proposed system
- Detail the data requirements and their sources including the role of the Knowledge Management System
- Indicate ways to fill key data gaps, or if necessary to amend logframe OVIs
- Propose the reporting framework including detailed report formats
- Suggest a practical phased implementation recognising the likely absence of key information
- Highlight the implementation risks

17. Provide an input to training materials should any Federal or State government wish to initiate an M&E training programme for its staff and other interested stakeholders.

Tasks related to the implementation of the M&E system

Ensuring data capture and analysis

18. The Service Provider will ensure that the required data is collected via the most appropriate means identified in the M&E Manual (manual to be designed by the Service Provider). This should involve accessing existing sources of government information plus the results of specially commissioned studies and surveys. The Service Provider will be responsible for commissioning this work, supervising its completion and presenting the results as part of the agreed reporting arrangements to DFID and the Government of Nigeria.

19. Where state and national level statistical information services are taking responsibility for data capture and analysis, the Service Provider will provide technical guidance, as required, to help ensure the quality of the product.

Updating risk analyses

20. As part of the annual monitoring exercises (in relation to the MOUs and state level logframes) the Service Provider will provide an updated risk analysis and risk mitigation strategy.

Sharing experiences and approaches with government

21. Where practical, the Service Provider will endeavour to work jointly with governments both to help transfer relevant M&E skills to their staff as well as to disseminate the results of the M&E work in SLP.

Participating in Annual Reviews

22. The Service Provider will participate as a member of the Annual Reviews in order to advise the Review Teams on the continued relevance of the OVIs and to ensure that the MoV are able to provide the required data and analysis. Participation in these Reviews will assist the Service Provider in monitoring the risks.

Preparing and submitting routine reports

23. The Service Provider will submit the range of M&E reports detailed in the Manual. Modifications may be made to the reporting framework and content based on the experience gained.

Completing thematic studies commissioned

24. It is expected that during the course of implementing SLP there will be cross-cutting themes that will require more detailed study in order to better inform the reform processes. Based on outline terms of reference the Service Provider will:

- Agree detailed ToRs with workplans and budget with DFID
- Commission the agreed studies and oversee the quality of the final reports
- Make recommendations for taking forward the conclusions in the context of SLP implementation

Recipient

25. The M&E services will be provided to DFID Nigeria, and shared with relevant departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the selected state and local governments where the Programmes are implemented. It will be the responsibility of DFID to agree reports, consulting government and other stakeholders as appropriate. The independent external monitor will be responsible for M&E across SPARC, PATHS2, ESSPIN and potentially GEMS - to be determined when GEMS' design phase is more advanced.

Working relations

26. Close working relationships, based on a clear understanding of respective roles and responsibilities, will need to be established by the Service Provider with:

- Programme consultancy teams in the states

- Federal and state level information and statistical services
- DFID's SLP oversight team based in Abuja

Reporting

27. After the initial three months design period (see para 29), the Service Provider's report should include a project memorandum, logical framework and updated TOR. Full implementation will proceed upon approval of the design documents by DFID in consultation with the Government of Nigeria. Thereafter the Service Provider will agree appropriate reporting arrangements with DFID Nigeria. These will need to be consistent with the reporting arrangements adopted within the states with governments as well as nationally within DFID.

28. It is expected that the Nigerian National Planning Commission, the lead states where the SLPs are focussed, and DFID's SLP oversight team, based in Abuja, represented by the lead adviser for SPARC, will be the primary 'clients' for the products of this consultancy.

Timeframe

29. The state programmes commenced between July and September 2008. For the design of the M&E system, by the Service Provider, a period of 3 months is scheduled. Full scale implementation of the system is expected to commence, possibly on a phased basis, from as soon as possible after July 2009. The Programmes are expected to be completed in March 2014. This consultancy contract is expected to last for a minimum of 5 years (with a possible extension of up to one year) to ensure that the post project impact assessment can be completed. A mid term review of the success of the M&E system will be commissioned by DFID during 2011.

Competencies

30. The Service Provider will be required to demonstrate proven experience in the design and implementation of multi dimensional development programmes. The likely range of skills include:

- Logframe design
- Information systems design and implementation
- Social science research
- Statistical survey and analysis
- Impact analysis and beneficiary assessment
- Risk assessment
- Policy evaluation

Background

31. The Programmes are a set of interlocking sectoral and governance programmes at the State level designed to complement each other. Currently

there is limited M&E and statistical information for each programme. The government data that is available, is generally limited, uncoordinated or not well presented.

32. The Project Memorandum for each programme sets out its scope of work. Broadly, SPARC aims to support strengthened governance arrangements at the State level, with SAVI an independently managed component focusing on accountability and voice. PATHS 2 is designed to improve financing, management and delivery of sustainable and replicable pro-poor health services. ESSPIN is designed to improve planning, financing, management and delivery of basic education services to achieve universal basic education in Nigeria. GEMS will set out to create an improved environment and boost potential for non-oil growth.

33. DFID plans to initially implement the Programmes in Kano, Kaduna, Jigawa, Lagos, Enugu and Cross River (with a combined population of 35 million) to maximise impact in those states and have a demonstration effect on others. These States have been selected using the results of a benchmarking exercise undertaken in 2005/06 by the Federal Government. Population size, poverty levels and history of engagement with partners were also taken into account. A further 2 Lead States will be identified in 2008.

34. The Programmes are being delivered as a single package to support transformation across the capacity of State Governments to deliver effective public services and support growth. For this reason, a common monitoring and evaluation process which will measure the mutually reinforcing effect of the SLP is essential. Key will be States capacity to undertake their own M&E of policies and programmes by then end of the period.

Annex: Draft Logical Frameworks for SPARC, ESPPIN, PATHS, and SAVI

SPARC Logical Framework

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators ⁵	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Goal Nigeria's own resources used efficiently and effectively to achieve MDGs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators which reflect attainment, or significant movement towards attainment, of the relevant MDGs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual reports of the Office of the Special Adviser for MDG 	
<p>Purpose The efficiency and effectiveness of selected state level governments' use of public resources is enhanced</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Measures of state government performance using DFID and state governance indicators and surveys Measures of public satisfaction on government performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State level governance assessments [DFID] Client satisfaction survey data drawn from National Living Standards Survey and Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire 	<p>[Purpose to Goal]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Politic will and critical mass to sustain reform agenda is maintained Nigeria remains committed to poverty reduction Economy does not contract and levels of oil revenues do not fall below critical levels Infrastructure sustained at appropriate levels International governments and development partners remain committed to good governance in Nigeria HIV/AIDS, malaria and TB incidence does not have negative effect on benefits Natural disasters and climate change do not negate benefits

⁵ Each indicator will be fully detailed on a datasheet and incorporated in a metadatabase

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Outputs</p> <p>1. Appropriate state policies and strategies adopted, monitored and evaluated</p>	<p>1.1 Measured improvements in the status and trends of scores used to assess policies and strategies in target states by 2013</p> <p>1.2 Numbers of effective sector strategies which are integrated into robust MTEF in target states by 2013</p> <p>1.3 Measures of improvement in overall status and trend of M&E assessments for target states by 2013</p> <p>1.4 Numbers of State Development Plans in place and reviewed annually that reflect MTEFs and state reform/change agenda by 2013</p> <p>1.5 Numbers of target states with strategies and policies which reflect priorities and capabilities of local government by 2013</p> <p>1.6 Numbers of non-target states actively developing changes in policy and strategy linked directly to lessons learned from SPARC initiatives by 2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual joint assessments by SPARC and state governments • Validated PEFA/SEAT baseline and reviews • Annual PERs • Due process investigations or successor arrangements • Reports of performance audits • Reports of functional reviews/organisational charts • Internal/external service user surveys • HR policy documents, regulations, procedures, reports • Establishment and payroll records • Staff satisfaction sheets • Political statements • State development plans and policies • Circulars and guidance notes from key federal agencies • Annual reports of key federal agencies <p style="text-align: right;">Continued...</p>	<p>[Output to Purpose]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizens' ability to claim rights and hold government accountable increased • Fiduciary risk is reduced to an acceptable level • Civil society remains committed to MDG • Mitigation measures reduce corruption to levels that no longer prevent efficient use of funds • Change reform is institutionalised [de-personalised] and support remains consistent through political/electoral cycles • Constitutional reform will not have negative effect on inter-government relations • Infrastructure sustained at appropriate levels⁶ • HIV/AIDS, malaria and TB incidence does not have negative effect on benefits
Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions

⁶ At this level infrastructure needs to be sufficient to allow achievement of the Purpose

<p>Outputs [continued]</p> <p>2. State public financial management improved</p>	<p>2.1 Measured improvement in status and trend of PEFA scores in target states by 2013</p> <p>2.2 Numbers of states with comprehensive MTEF processes achieving release of funds in line with budgets operational by 2013</p> <p>2.3 Measured increase in savings achieved through due process investigation of procurement activities providing value for money in target states by 2013</p> <p>2.4 Numbers of non-target states actively developing changes in PFM linked directly to lessons learned from SPARC initiatives by 2013</p>	<p>Continued...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfaction survey of state counterpart agencies • State development plans and policies • Circulars and guidance notes from key federal agencies • Annual reports of key federal agencies • Satisfaction survey of state counterpart agencies 	<p>As above</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Outputs [continued]</p> <p>3. State civil service performance improved</p> <p>4. Federal support to state governance improved</p>	<p>3.1 Numbers of MDA structures aligned with functions in target states by 2013</p> <p>3.2 Numbers of key central MDA and selected sectors with quantified improvements in performance and efficiency in target states by 2013</p> <p>3.3 Numbers of states implementing quantified improvements in HRM policies and processes by 2013</p> <p>3.4 Numbers of states with quantifiable improvements in staff satisfaction, morale and welfare by 2013</p> <p>3.5 Numbers of non-target states actively developing changes in public sector reform linked directly to lessons learned from SPARC initiatives by 2013</p> <p>4.1 Numbers of target and non target states where state legislation and policy reflects quantifiable response to federal guidance by 2013</p> <p>4.2 Number of target and non-target states where improvements in performance are attributable to measurable support from Federal Government by 2013</p> <p>4.3 Number of Federal agency initiatives and support structures which reflect state requirements by 2013</p> <p>4.4 Numbers of target and non-target states which report quantifiable increases in satisfaction with federal support by 2013</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>

Narrative Summary	Budgets and Inputs	Assumptions
<p>Activities⁷ [1. Appropriate state policies and strategies adopted, monitored and evaluated] 1.1 SPARC specific generic activities for this Output need to be developed... 1.2 Establish appropriate structures to support Programme implementation 1.3 Review, identify and strengthen funding and policy and strategy development arrangements of MDA in collaboration with other SLP programmes 1.4 Identify, stimulate and promote the development of appropriate information and knowledge management systems and markets for policy and strategies in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p> <p>[2. State PFM improved] 2.1 SPARC specific generic activities for this Output need to be developed... 2.2 Establish appropriate structures to support Programme implementation 2.3 Provision of support and guidance to budget reform including development of sector-specific budgeting mechanisms and funding systems in collaboration with other SLP programmes 2.4 Identify, stimulate and promote the development of appropriate information and knowledge management systems and markets for PFM in</p>		<p>[Activity to Output]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human resource capacity is adequate to implement reforms • Political stability and civil order is adequate • Vested interests resistant to reform do not destabilise the process • Effective oversight structures to enable state governments to coordinate SLP are operationalised • External timeframes for planning do not disrupt coordination • Delays in signing and implementing external MoU between DFID and state governments do not disrupt programme implementation • Adequate funds are available for staff costs of reorganisation and pay/benefit reform • Law and order situation does not undermine benefits • Stability of state structures is retained • Infrastructure sustained at appropriate levels⁸ • HIV/AIDS, malaria and TB incidence does not have negative effect on benefits

⁷ Generic Activities to be developed based on broad areas already identified including: Diagnosis, Development (planning/negotiation), Systems development, Capacity building, Lesson learning, Coordination, Management, Monitoring and evaluation

⁸ At this level infrastructure only needs to be adequate to allow delivery of Outputs

collaboration with other SLP programmes		
-----------------------------------------	--	--

Narrative Summary	Budgets and Inputs	Assumptions
<p>Activities [continued]</p> <p>[3. State civil service performance improved]</p> <p>3.1 SPARC specific generic activities for this Output need to be developed...</p> <p>3.2 Establish appropriate structures to support Programme implementation</p> <p>3.3 Identify, stimulate and promote the development of appropriate information and knowledge management systems and markets for civil service performance in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p>		
<p>[4. Federal support to state governance reform improved]</p> <p>4.1 SPARC specific generic activities for this Output need to be developed...</p> <p>4.2 Establish appropriate structures to support Programme implementation</p> <p>4.3 Identify, stimulate and promote the development of appropriate information and knowledge management systems and markets for providing federal support to governance reform in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p>	As above	As above

ESSPIN Logical Framework

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Goal Nigeria's own resources are efficiently and effectively used to achieve the MDGs for universal education and gender equity⁹</p>	<p>Indicators which reflect aspects of <i>gender equity</i> and <i>access to basic education</i> described in the relevant MDG by 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Household surveys (EdData, MICS) (for MDG 2.1, 2.2, 3.1) • School census (for MDG 2.2, 3.1) • [?] (for MDG 2.3) 	
<p>Purpose The planning, financing and delivery of sustainable and replicable basic education services in terms of access, equity and quality are improved at Federal level and in up to six States¹⁰</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage increase in the number of pupils, disaggregated by gender and LGA, enrolling and transiting in each year of primary education, and completing junior secondary school, in target states by 2014 2. Percentage increases in learning outcome scores at primary and junior-secondary schools in target states by 2014 3. Percentage increase in the number of states and federal level, that develop and implement ESOP/MTSSs and 4. Percentage increase in the number of states which fully utilise available funds to implement their ESOP/MTSS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School census • State EMIS data • Monitoring learning achievement surveys (MLA) • Public expenditure records • NLSS/CWIQ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic growth remains at levels adequate to support required expenditure • Adequate political and economic stability is maintained within the region to support benefits gained • The model of education reform is replicable in non-target states • HIV/AIDS and malaria incidence does not undermine gains achieved • GoN funds to the education sector are allocated and disbursed in a transparent manner • Incentives to complete basic education [financial, employment, places in secondary and tertiary training] exist • Strong demand for secular-based education exists • Incentives for basic education

⁹ This is interpreted as meaning *Effective and efficient use of Nigeria's own resources for education and gender equity realised* with indicators showing achievement of the MDG

¹⁰ This is interpreted as meaning *Sustainable and replicable basic education services improved* with indicators showing how access, equity, quality and management have been addressed

outweigh opportunity costs

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Outputs</p> <p>1. Federal Government governance framework for enabling basic education reform strengthened</p>	<p>1.1 Increased levels of evidenced-based policy research by 2014</p> <p>1.2 Increased percentage of allocated Federal funds being disbursed by 2014</p> <p>1.3 Measures of increased levels of compliance with minimum standards for resourcing of schools .</p> <p>1.4 Percentage of states utilising EMIS and quality assurance frameworks by 2014</p> <p>1.5 Measures of the variation in spending from ESOP budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proceedings of JCCE/NCE • UBEC and MDG Office expenditure records • Annual sector review • Public expenditure records • <i>School census</i> • <i>States' EMIS data</i> • <i>Opinion polls</i> • <i>SMOE and SUBEB records and reports</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political and economic stability exists at appropriate levels • Political support for reforms remains consistent • Financial and employment incentives to complete basic education [financial, employment, places in secondary and tertiary training] exist • Oil revenue and economic growth is sustained and supports reform processes
<p>2. State-level and local government-level governance and management of basic education strengthened</p>	<p>2.1 Measures of progress against ESP targets in target states by 2014</p> <p>2.2 Measures of the variation in states' spending from ESOP budgets</p> <p>2.3 Increase in the number of states updating ESOP on an annual basis in target states by 2014</p> <p>2.4 Percentage increase in awareness levels of target population with respect to educational sector reform in target states by 2014</p> <p>2.5 Percentage increase in number of schools with staff being evaluated against performance/competency indicators in target states by 2014</p> <p>2.6 Number of schools being inspected under reformed QA system</p> <p>2.7 Measures of performance from reformed M&E systems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public expenditure tracking and service delivery survey • Household surveys • Opinion polls • Surveys, studies and data generated by other SLPs • Stakeholder surveys • Inspectorate reports • M&E reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School age population doesn't outstrip education sector and states' capacity • Ability of states to support reforms is sustained • Population migration doesn't strain the education sector • Private sector provision of education continues to meet demand • Institutional reforms in public sector enhance governance

<p>3. Capacity of primary and junior-secondary schools to provide a high quality learning environment developed and sustained</p>	<p>3.1 Percentage of schools preparing and implementing School Development Plans (SDPs) by 2014</p> <p>3.2 Measures of the increase in availability and utilisation of equipment and learning resources in schools in target states by 2014</p> <p>3.3 Percentage of schools being graded satisfactory in inspections, in target states by 2014</p> <p>3.4 Percentage increases in teachers being graded as satisfactory in target states by 2014</p> <p>3.5 Percentage increases in head teachers being graded as satisfactory in target states by 2014</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>4. Capacity of communities and civil society to articulate demand for educational services created and sustained</p>	<p>4.1 Increases in the percentage of the population by gender and location who know what standards of service to expect and what their rights, responsibilities and access to resources are in target states by 2014</p> <p>4.2 Percentage increase in the numbers of target LGEAs responding specifically to outcomes from stakeholder consultation in target states by 2014</p> <p>4.3 Percentage increase in number of SBMCs, demonstrably providing support to schools</p>		

Narrative Summary	Budgets and Inputs	Assumptions
<p>Activities – All ESSPIN Activities will provide support to the following areas:</p> <p>1.5 Review, identify and strengthen funding and policy arrangements of ministries, departments and agencies in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p> <p>1.6 Provide support to the development and implementation of quality assurance standards for basic education</p> <p>1.7 Strengthen mechanisms for formulation, facilitation and advocacy of policy options for educational reform [NCE process]</p> <p>1.8 Identify and promote the development of appropriate information and knowledge management systems and mechanisms in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p> <p>1.9 Development of systems for monitoring state level performance in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p> <p>2.1 Undertake analyses of educational sector including, <i>inter alia</i>, demographic, economic, socio-economic issues – gender, religion, disabilities etc</p> <p>2.2 Assess and review <i>financing gap</i> in basic education to identify optimum scenarios</p> <p>2.3 Support and promote the development of a 10 year sector plan with stakeholders</p> <p>2.4 Development of an Educational Sector Operational Plan [ESOP]</p> <p>2.5 Budget reform including development of budgeting mechanisms and funding systems for schools in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p> <p>2.6 Support institutional development and reform of human resource development systems and capacity</p> <p>2.7 Implementation of ESOPs</p> <p>2.8 Alignment of ESOPs with SEEDS in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p> <p>2.9 Development of systems for monitoring performance of primary and junior-secondary schools</p> <p>2.10 Identify, develop and promote appropriate information and knowledge management systems and mechanisms in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p>	<p>To be completed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gains are not compromised by lack of political will or support from government and unions • Support remains consistent through political cycles • Availability and nature of places in secondary and tertiary training provides incentives to complete basic education • Changes and reforms are institutionalised and support is de-personalised • Skilled staff are retained within the educational sector • HIV/AIDS and malaria levels do not adversely affect gains • Capacity and will exists at state-level to respond to benefits/gains • Expansion of post-basic education encourages demand for basic education

Narrative Summary	Budget and Inputs	Assumptions
<p>Activities continued</p> <p>3.1 Situation analysis and review to establish baseline data set</p> <p>3.2 Capacity strengthening of school leadership, management, quality development and quality assurance</p> <p>3.3 Development of school governance and school development plans as a means of linking a range of school improvement initiatives</p> <p>3.4 Develop appropriate responses and strategies aimed at increasing enrolment and attendance (especially for girls)</p> <p>3.5 Provide support to Teacher Service reform including, <i>inter alia</i>, gender sensitive career structures & recruitment, planning, policy, conditions of service, incentives (particularly for female teachers in remote areas), training, deployment and management</p> <p>3.6 Provide support to systems for better resourcing of schools with materials, equipment, infrastructure and water and sanitation (especially to encourage enrolment & retention of girls) in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p> <p>3.7 Provide support to strengthen and improve learning outcomes</p> <p>3.8 Development of appropriate responses to requirements for skills development and PPP</p> <p>3.9 Development of appropriate responses to health education, school health and HIV/AIDS, family health with other SLP programmes</p> <p>3.10 Support the identification, development and promotion of information and knowledge management systems and mechanisms to strengthen M&E in the education sector in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p>	As above	As above
<p>4.1 Undertake analysis to document and understand the status, needs and demands of <i>out of school</i> children</p> <p>4.2 Mapping of civil society organisations in educational sector with other SLP programmes</p> <p>4.3 Review current, and develop further, initiatives aimed at encouraging demand for education especially for girls</p> <p>4.4 Development of appropriate responses to situation analysis including IQTE, girls education, special needs, social exclusion, HIV/AIDS in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p> <p>4.5 Empowerment of civil society and communities, including, <i>inter alia</i>, availability of information, communication, learning outcomes, use and articulation, campaigns, advocacy skills in collaboration with other SLP programmes</p>		

4.6 Increasing and encouraging the participation of community (especially women) and civil society in governance in collaboration with other SLP programmes		
4.7 Identify, develop and promote appropriate information and knowledge management systems and mechanisms in collaboration with other SLP programmes		

PATHS 2 Logical Framework

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Goal</p> <p>Nigeria's own resources are efficiently and effectively used to achieve the MDGs</p>	<p>Reduced infant and child mortality</p> <p>Reduced maternal mortality</p> <p>Reduced incidence of TB and malaria</p>	<p>DHS</p> <p>HMIS</p>	
<p>Purpose</p> <p>To improve the planning, financing and delivery of sustainable and replicable pro-poor¹¹ services for common health problems in up to 6 states¹²</p>	<p>X% increase in the allocated funds budgeted and utilised for the implementation of improved MTSS in at least 4 states by EOP</p> <p>X% increase in number of women and children attending MCH services by EOP, disaggregated by gender (for children), wealth quintile, and rural/urban location</p> <p>X% increase in the percentage of 12-23 month old children immunised as per the National Immunisation Schedule in the lead states by EOP, disaggregated by gender, wealth quintile, and rural/urban location</p> <p>Number of states and federal level institutions, that develop and implement PATHS2 systems strengthening approaches to increase access to quality health services by EOP</p>	<p>Public Expenditure Review</p> <p>Review of MTSS in lead states</p> <p>HMIS</p> <p>DHS</p> <p>Immunisation Coverage Survey</p> <p>Programme reports</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p> <p>National Council on Health reports</p>	<p>Political and economic stability exists at all levels</p> <p>Oil revenue and economic growth is sustained and supports reform processes</p> <p>Political support for reforms remains consistent and is sensitive to the needs of the poor and other marginalised groups</p> <p>SLPs and development partners working together effectively and</p>

¹¹ The PATHS2 team understands the term 'pro-poor' as meaning all citizens have equitable access to health services, irrespective of their financial means

¹² The PATHS2 team interpret the purpose statement as meaning *Sustainable and replicable health systems delivering accessible, accountable, and equitable services are strengthened*

			achieving their intended objectives
--	--	--	-------------------------------------

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Output 1</p> <p>Stewardship role for health at national level strengthened</p>	<p>New health policies and legislation at federal level are evidence-based, gender sensitive, pro-poor, increasingly responsive to citizen views, and consistent with the achievement of the MDGs by EOP</p> <p>Increased percentage of allocated federal funds for health being disbursed by EOP</p> <p>Increase in number of national institutions with publicly available annual government expenditure reports by EOP</p> <p>Increase in number of national institutions with regulatory frameworks being enforced in the public and private sector by EOP</p> <p>Increase in number of states and Federal institutions with increased capacity for HMIS linked to National HMIS by EOP</p> <p>Donor coordination forum meets at least bi-annually for joint reviews, planning and forecasting at federal level</p>	<p>Policy review</p> <p>National Assembly records</p> <p>Federal and State Government reports</p> <p>Review of Federal and State Government expenditure reports</p> <p>Participatory Public Expenditure Review and benefit incidence analysis</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p> <p>SERVICOM reports</p> <p>CSO budget monitoring reports</p> <p>NHMIS data and reports</p> <p>Minutes and reports from donor co-ordination meetings and reviews</p>	<p>Political and economic stability exists at all levels</p> <p>Oil revenue and economic growth is sustained and supports reform processes</p> <p>Political support for reforms remains consistent and is sensitive to the needs of the poor and other marginalised groups</p> <p>SLPs and development partners working together effectively and achieving their intended objectives</p>
<p>Output 2</p> <p>Systems to deliver pro-poor, responsive health services improved</p>	<p>New health policies and legislation in lead states are evidence-based, gender sensitive, pro-poor, increasingly responsive to citizen views, and consistent with the achievement of the MDGs by EOP</p> <p>X% increase in the allocated funds budgeted and utilized for maternal and child health</p>	<p>Policy reviews</p> <p>State Assembly records</p> <p>Public Expenditure Review</p> <p>CSO budget monitoring reports</p>	<p>Policy makers, authorities, and health providers willing to engage with civil society and respond to citizen voice</p> <p>State and Federal leaders</p>

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>services by EOP</p> <p>X% of health facilities in targeted LGAs able to deliver full essential package of care by EOP</p> <p>X lead states and X% of LGAs in lead states with effective pro-poor health financing mechanisms (safety nets) by EOP</p> <p>By EOP, X% increase in the number of skilled health workers with greater equity in terms of gender and geographical distribution</p> <p>Donor coordination forum meets at least bi-annually for joint reviews, planning and forecasting at state level</p>	<p>Situational Analysis and/or Needs Assessments</p> <p>Baseline survey reports</p> <p>Review of routine reports from HF, Ministries etc</p> <p>Human resource analysis</p> <p>Minutes and reports from donor co-ordination meetings and reviews</p>	<p>allow communications professionals appropriate editorial direction and freedom of expression</p>
<p>Output 3</p> <p>Delivery of and access to sustainable, efficient, pro-poor health services and supplies improved</p>	<p>X% increase in the number of health facilities in lead states with essential drugs consistently available by EOP, disaggregated by level of care (primary, secondary)</p> <p>X% increase in the number of health facilities in lead states with adequate and functional equipment based on national standards and specifications, by EOP</p> <p>X% increase in the number of public and private health facilities providing quality essential package of care in lead states by EoP, disaggregated by level of care (primary, secondary)</p> <p>X% increase in the proportion of clients in lead states reporting satisfaction with health services by EOP, disaggregated by gender</p>	<p>Routine inventory stock-take, focusing on selected drugs</p> <p>Equipment inventory</p> <p>State Government reports</p> <p>HMIS</p> <p>DHS</p> <p>PPRHAA and ISS reports</p> <p>Health facility surveys</p> <p>Programme reports</p> <p>Anonymous client surveys</p> <p>Client feedback reports</p> <p>Independent reviews of safe</p>	

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>and rural/urban location</p> <p>Increase in staff found present in PHC facilities as percentage of staff expected based on payroll per establishment in lead states by EOP</p> <p>X% of communities in lead states have functioning and sustainable community mechanisms to overcome financial, social, and cultural barriers to access to emergency obstetric care by EOP</p>	<p>motherhood initiatives</p>	
<p>Output 4</p> <p>Ability of citizens and civil society to increase the accountability and responsiveness of the health system improved</p>	<p>By EOP, X% increase in the number of Facility Health Committees in primary and secondary health settings meet an agreed standard for community participation</p> <p>By EOP, at least 4 lead states are formally committed to civil society participation in policy development and budgeting, with at least one effective budget tracking exercise conducted in each state, and a clear time-bound strategy for the institutionalisation of the process in at least 2 states</p> <p>By EOP, 70% of issue-based advocacy campaigns supported by PATHS2 achieve stated objectives, as detailed in strategies</p> <p>By EOP, each state has at least one established and functioning system for defining and enforcing health rights and entitlements, with demonstrated access for women and excluded groups</p>	<p>Sentinel community monitoring</p> <p>PPRHAA and ISS reports</p> <p>State policy and strategy statements</p> <p>Civil society budget tracking reports and evaluations</p> <p>SAVI S-DOC monitoring</p> <p>Implementing partners' monitoring with periodic external evaluations</p> <p>Independent review of advocacy campaigns</p> <p>SERVICOM reports against health charter</p>	

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Output 5</p> <p>Capacity of citizens to make informed choices about prevention, treatment, and care strengthened</p>	<p>X% increase in number of people (disaggregated by gender, age, and urban/rural location) who have heard, seen or participated in public dialogue on key health issues in the last two months by EOP</p> <p>Targeted health communications strategies implemented by key partner organisations¹³ have increased impact against stated objectives by EOP</p> <p>X% increase of target groups (e.g., mothers of children under five) who know and follow the correct protocols for preventing and/or managing selected health conditions from X at baseline by EOP</p> <p>X% increase in the number of people (disaggregated by gender, age, and urban/rural location) aware of key health service entitlements, rights, and responsibilities by EOP</p>	<p>Audience surveys</p> <p>DHS</p> <p>Media monitoring reports</p> <p>Communication reports</p> <p>Independent reviews</p>	

¹³ Including government communications departments, universities, and media organisations

Output 1 Activities

- Support the FMOH to implement national regulatory frameworks, the National Health Bill and other quality assurance standards for the health sector
- Support the FMOH and other federal agencies to review and strengthen policy, planning, and budgeting arrangements, in collaboration with other partners, especially SPARC
- Support the FMOH and other federal agencies to streamline national logistics management systems
- Assist the FMOH and other partners to review and strengthen systems for public financial and expenditure management including National Health Accounts (NHA), in collaboration with SPARC
- Assist the FMOH and other federal partners to strengthen performance monitoring and mutual accountability among all stakeholders in the health sector
- Support the FMOH to promote effective donor coordination in the health sector
- Strengthen the FMOH's institutional capacity for implementing the human resources for health policy and strategic plan, in collaboration with SPARC
- Strengthen FMOH and other federal agencies' knowledge management systems in collaboration with other SLPs and development partners
- Support the FMOH to develop and implement the National Strategic Health Development Plan (NSHDP) with other stakeholders
- Promote research as a basis for evidence-based decision-making in health policy and planning
- Support the FMOH to promote public-private partnerships as an effective and efficient means of service delivery
- Work with the FMOH to strengthen systems for federal-state collaboration in health planning and implementation
- Support the FMOH to strengthen mechanisms for health sector monitoring and evaluation, in collaboration with other SLPs and development partners
- Support the FMOH to develop mechanisms for integrating health service delivery at all levels

Output 2 Activities

- Support SMOHs in lead states to strengthen gender sensitive and pro-poor state-level health planning and implementation processes in collaboration with SPARC and other state-level health programmes
- Support SMOHs in lead states to strengthen state systems for public financial and expenditure management including the State Health Accounts in collaboration with SPARC
- Support SMOHs and other relevant agencies in lead states to strengthen HMIS, M & E, administrative, and procurement systems at the state, LGA, and community level
- Build the capacity of health care managers and providers on procurement and SCM through training on procurement, delivery, storage, inventory control, and logistics management information systems
- Support SMOHs and other relevant agencies in lead states to strengthen and promote appropriate knowledge management systems in collaboration with other SLPs and development partners
- Support SMOHs in lead states to put in place policies and regulatory systems that will strengthen public-private partnerships for the delivery of health services
- Assist SMOHs and other relevant agencies in lead states to further develop and implement a gender sensitive human resources policy at the state level, including HMIS/Human Resources

Output 3 Activities

- Support the provision of pro-poor and gender sensitive quality health services in the states
- Support promotion of financial, social and physical access of poor and vulnerable groups, especially women and children in collaboration with other SLPs
- Support the implementation of the essential package of care in the states
- Strengthen involvement and capacity of the private sector (profit and not-for-profit) in the provision of quality health care services in collaboration with SAVI
- Support capacity development of service providers on supply chain and health commodity logistics (SDSS including DRF), in collaboration with related programmes and partners (e.g. SUNMAP, PRRINN-MNCH, UN agencies)

- Strengthen integration, linkages, and referrals of service delivery at all levels, and especially PHC, in collaboration with other health programmes
- Promote linkages between health facilities and communities through strengthening of the ward health system, REW (Reach Every Ward), and facility health committees, etc.
- Support and improve experience-sharing among service providers
- Strengthen service providers' capacity for data management and utilisation, including the use of gender disaggregated data to improve health service delivery

Output 4 Activities

- Support community level participatory analysis to identify actors, gatekeepers, and to establish baseline
- Support communities and facility staff to create vision for working together (inclusive approach, involving women, poorest and most marginalised)
- Support civil society and communities to develop and test models of community participation in facility health committees, including oversight of DRF/D&E management where they are operational and ensuring responsive services
- Work with government and civil society partners to assess opportunities to establish patient charters and standards of care (SERVICOM etc.)
- Support government to put in place mechanisms to enable citizens to claim their rights and entitlements, such as participatory budget tracking, patient charters, standards of care, and community score cards
- Support issue-based coalitions addressing the needs of women and the poorest, in collaboration with SAVI
- Build capacity among issue-based coalitions to track government resource allocation for health
- Support the development of effective advocacy coalitions including professional associations, faith-based organisations and influential leaders
- Support the sharing of advocacy and accountability best practice and lessons learned through operations research, monitoring, and dissemination
- Support intensive monitoring of selected communities to track improvements in access, especially for women and the

poorest

- Support formative research and monitoring at LGA, community, and facility level, focused both on process and outcome
- Provide ongoing professional development and mentoring for PATHS2 staff and national consultants

Output 5 Activities

- Consultation, research, assessment, and planning to develop effective, gender sensitive communication strategies in collaboration with government partners, other SLPs, media partners, and other stakeholders
- Support harmonisation of state-level health communications
- Convene and stimulate informed debate and dialogue at different levels to support an environment where health-related issues can be discussed more openly
- Provide support to the FMOH and SMOHs to improve information flow and accountability to the public
- Provide support to strengthen key Nigerian institutions and professionals' capacity to effectively design, implement, and monitor targeted, pro-poor health communications accurately and accessibly
- Review and, where appropriate, develop and implement targeted communication vehicles utilising a variety of platforms to raise public awareness of citizens' rights, entitlements, and responsibilities for priority health conditions in partnership with government and other key partners
- Review and, where appropriate, develop and implement targeted communication vehicles utilising a variety of platforms to increase understanding of evidence-based information on prevention, treatment, and care for priority health conditions in partnership with communications departments of key government agencies and health partners
- Develop appropriate responses to health and well-being education for children and young people in and out of school settings, in collaboration with ESSPIN and government partners
- Promote sharing of national and international best practice in communication in collaboration with other SLPs

SAVI Logical Framework

Narrative Summary	OVIs	MoVs	Assumptions
<p>Goal</p> <p><i>Nigeria's own resources used efficiently and effectively to achieve MDGs</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved government performance in capability, accountability and responsiveness. 2. Reduced infant and child mortality 3. Reduced maternal mortality 4. Reduced incidence of HIV, TB and malaria 5. Progress towards universal primary education 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CGA and individual SGAs 2. DHS 3. DHS, HMIS 4. HMIS 5. EMIS; CWIQ <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px auto; width: fit-content;"> Goal OVIs and MOVs defined and measured by DFID </div>	
<p>Purpose</p> <p><i>The efficiency and effectiveness of selected state level governments' use of public resources is enhanced¹⁴</i></p>	<p>P1. Improved quality of governance across both government and civil society</p> <p>P2. Citizens increasingly</p>	<p>P1. New survey (to be designed), drawing on existing governance surveys¹⁵ done by 'Component 2'¹⁶ organisations¹⁶, with participation of Govt</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding sources for existing CSOs do not lead to them losing their independence • Government-sponsored CSOs do not gain undue voice and influence in civil

¹⁴ For SAVI this is interpreted as: 'Civil society and government better fulfil their roles and responsibilities in achieving improved use of public resources (reflecting measures of effectiveness and efficiency), which is more socially inclusive and responsive to citizens' rights and demands'.

¹⁵ V&A Governance Index aggregating KKM, CIVICUS, ARVIN, etc. to include indices of constructive engagement and challenge function between CS and Govt. ... e.g. a) Publication of Govt reports (eg on budget) ... b) Review of communications on policy and implementation, undertaken by ?, c) Tracking initiatives (eg Open Budget)

¹⁶ i.e. those partnering with SAVI on government policy monitoring and research activities. This programme component could be expanded to accommodate the need for CS to assess itself through tools such as the V&A Governance Index.

¹⁷ To be designed jointly with other SLPs during inception ...

	<p>report confidence that advocacy will deliver dividends for them</p> <p>P3. Demonstrable improvements in resource allocation and service delivery, attributable to improved engagement between civil society and government</p> <p>P4. The benefits of improved resource allocation and service delivery reach normally excluded groups as a result of their interests being included in advocacy on key issues</p>	<p>P2. Attitudinal survey</p> <p>P3. Case studies and IBP reports</p> <p>P4. Disaggregated analysis of advocacy issues through SAVI's gender & social exclusion action framework (to be designed)¹⁷</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ participatory surveys of normally excluded groups ○ media analysis ○ analysis of advocacy materials & events 	<p>society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factions within society do not create instabilities that adversely affect poverty-reducing resource allocation • Priorities of civil society and government sufficiently map on to MDG targets • The power of vested interests who oppose increased voice and accountability do not increase beyond the capacity of civil society to respond • Economy does not contract and levels of oil revenues do not fall below critical levels • International governments and development partners remain committed to good governance in Nigeria • Existing lead state governments continue their reform agenda and engagement with civil
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			society post 2011 elections.
--	--	--	------------------------------

Narrative Summary	OVIs	MoVs	Assumptions
<p>Output 1</p> <p><i>Linkages between civil society and government improved¹⁸</i></p> <p><i>(previously: Improved systems for accountability and voice established and operational)</i></p>	<p>1.1. QQ¹⁹ State & local governments adopt new/improved accountability and participatory governance systems in response to civil society demand by Yr 2/4^{20, 21}.</p> <p>1.2. Civil society satisfaction with the operation of accountability and participatory governance systems in X SLP States increases by QQ % by Yr 5.</p> <p>1.3 X CSOs²² outside, and QQ%²³ of known CSOs within lead states have knowledge of the processes by which these improved linkages developed²⁴</p>	<p>1.1. Baseline/Years 2 & 4 audit of accountability and participatory governance systems in State and Local Govts, undertaken by IBPs or Component 2 research</p> <p>1.2. Baseline & Yr 5 repeat scorecard on accountability systems, undertaken by IBPs.</p> <p>1.3. minuted reference to SAVI supported processes during inter-CSO, CSO fora meetings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPARC is able to deliver its objectives to a satisfactory degree (i.e. improves the key functions of government in lead states)²⁵ • Other initiatives do not develop alternative systems (linkages) which then provide opportunity to circumvent agreed standards and procedures for A&V • Formalisation of A&V does not result in capture and perverse incentives for both civil society and government • A&V systems can fairly reconcile plural ideologies (e.g. tensions between UBE targets and preferences for Quranic education in the North of Nigeria) • Relevant SHA Members and functionaries are willing to work with

¹⁸ Discuss with DFID: extent to which SAVI works with government directly, eg NOA, Min of Info, Budget Office, as well as Line Ministries. See Assumption 3

¹⁹ Quantification of target to be defined once baseline has been established

²⁰ e.g. govts demonstrate increased willingness and ability to communicate transparently and in a timely manner on public resource use - by improving the quality, breadth and volume of reporting and communications

²¹ Recognising the elections in Year 3

²² Definition of CSOs, not = NGOs, but a much broader range of groups of CS actors covering, FBOs, unions, associations, traditional authorities, etc.

²³ Based on database generated by S-DOC CSO mapping studies

²⁴ Through establishment of 'communities of practice'

²⁵ i.e. adequate public resources are released at state and local government levels to allow responsiveness to advocacy; better PFM and public sector management leads to improved releases and utilisation

Narrative Summary	OVIs	MoVs	Assumptions
			SAVI and its range of partners in civil society <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constitutional reforms do not negatively impact on the oversight role of SHAs • Fiscal Responsibility legislation is passed and enacted at state level • Federal Freedom of Information Act is passed, and is cascaded to States • Turf protection and competition for resources between CSOs does not undermine coalition communications and networking • On issues relating to education and health (and growth and justice in due course) the Executive in States and LGAs are willing to create spaces for civil society engagement
Output 2 <i>Effective evidence-based advocacy by civil society established</i>	2.1. Qualitative assessment of strengthened skills and capability of CSOs in key areas of KM and strategic advocacy skills and media-use	2.1. CSO capacity assessment in S-DOC and periodic peer-review of outputs from CSOs during project, monitoring e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CSOs have Communications strategies ○ Availability of info on web ○ Media coverage of the IBP advocacy issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above

²⁶ Methods to be identified through the development of SAVI's gender & social exclusion action framework

Narrative Summary	OVIs	MoVs	Assumptions
	<p>2.2. New evidence is generated and increasingly used by civil society organisations and coalitions in policy advocacy</p> <p>2.3. Advocacy improves in quality by increasingly reflecting diverse views in society</p> <p>2.4 The media improves the quality of their coverage of public and social sector reform issues</p>	<p>2.2a. For SAVI funded work, self-monitoring and periodic peer-review of advocacy outputs, explaining how research, policy analysis and independent monitoring have been used.</p> <p>2.2b. For wider civil society, a Component 2 research activity on evidence.</p> <p>2.3 An assessment of the inclusivity of advocacy material²⁶</p> <p>2.4 Comparative analysis (before and after) of media coverage on key issues from media analysis (e.g. news clippings, recordings)</p>	
<p>Output 3</p> <p><i>Responsiveness, accountability and capability of State Houses of Assembly increased</i></p>	<p>3.1. SHA bodies with PFM responsibilities exercise improved oversight of public resource use by the State and local executives, as quantified by volume of queries raised by SHAs</p> <p>3.2. Citizen’s access to their Members improved, and feedback and accountability mechanisms established and used</p>	<p>3.1. Biannual PEFA+ style assessment of SHAs (Members and functionaries), in all SAVI States. Baseline in Inception Phase.</p> <p>3.2. Periodic poll of citizens, and reports of system for monitoring access, based on a sample of constituencies involved in SLP activities and ‘control’</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above

Narrative Summary	OVIs	MoVs	Assumptions
	<p>3.3. By the end of the project, in at least 33% of advocacy projects, Members of SHAs are perceived to have played a positive role</p>	<p>constituencies in all SAVI States (e.g. number of public meetings held by Members in their own constituencies each year, and frequency of dissemination of House proceedings to their constituencies)</p> <p>3.3. Survey of CSOs and constituencies involved in advocacy projects, as well as feedback from Members involved</p>	
<p>Output 4</p> <p><i>More inclusive civil society constituencies established²⁷</i></p> <p><i>(previously: Government and civil society more willing and better able to communicate transparently)²⁸</i></p>	<p>4.1. CSOs' & CBOs' advocacy through engagement in participatory governance systems and use of the media represents an increasingly socially and gender inclusive set of voices</p> <p>4.2. QQ% of known state-level CSOs²⁹ within lead states better</p>	<p>4.1 Qualitative analysis using baseline, mid-point and final satisfaction survey with citizens, undertaken by Component 2 research.</p> <p>4.2 monitoring through SAVI's gender & social exclusion action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As above

²⁷ Justification for new output: The thinking here is inclusion of the voiceless, to develop voice, space and platforms in order to challenge Government and for excluded groups to have their voices heard and to change the present rules and secure sustainable outcomes in favour of the marginalised / excluded. This would then link to the other outputs through various types of advocacy work based on better quality evidence, developed linkages between CS actors with the key entry point into Government through a more responsive and accountable SHA.

²⁸ The previous output and several of its indicators are now subsumed by output 1

²⁹ Based in lists generated through S-DOC CSO mapping.

³⁰ i.e. with the attitude of working together with others to achieve a common objective rather than working alone, as the basis of an institutional relationship with others in CS (coalitions-type approach)

Narrative Summary	OVIs	MoVs	Assumptions
	<p>represent the interests of local level CSOs & CBOs within their state</p> <p>4.3 membership of and participation in state-level multi-CSO platforms (i.e. fora, umbrella bodies, networks for relating with govt, donors, other states, national CSOs, etc) by normally excluded groups increased by QQ% by end of programme.</p> <p>4.4. By the end of the project, CSOs work in a coupled manner³⁰ on other key issues without SAVI's involvement</p>	<p>framework (to be designed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ satisfaction surveys of normally excluded groups ○ media analysis ○ analysis of advocacy materials & events ○ minutes of state-level CSO meetings <p>4.3 membership records and minutes of meetings</p> <p>4.4a. Review of proportion of advocacy projects that involve more than one CSO</p> <p>4.4b. Existence of sustaining CSO relations, post-IBP</p> <p>4.4c. Review of number of joint authored reports / citations of other work in reports</p>	

Narrative Summary	Budget & Inputs	Assumptions
<p><u>Activities</u></p> <p><i>(1. Linkages between civil society and government improved)</i></p> <p>1.1 Identification and initial engagement with existing platforms for dialogue between CS and govt at both state and LG level in each state (both broadly and in relation to SAVI oversight structures)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ST-TA will be available within the time limitations of the inception period ● There will be no major slippage of the S-DOC study components ● There will be sufficient time to engage with the SHAs

<p>1.2 Engagement and assessment of state level partners through S-DOC studies – identification of issues, actors and potential coalition partners for project implementation</p> <p>1.3 Support to development of CS V&A governance index</p> <p>1.4 Identify and explore opportunities for tangential linkages between govt and CS in lead states (for budget monitoring and expenditure tracking) created by C4C (through MVPF in Enugu and Kano)</p> <p>1.5 Identify hubs for Communities of Practice (CoPs) in each state</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity of human resources in SHAs is sufficient to undertake a reform agenda • CSO capacity, in human and financial resources, is sufficient to engage in SAVI supported advocacy work • Political stability and civil order in the states is adequate • Effective oversight structures for SAVI (TEC & SAP) that are acceptable to state govt can be established • State team can manage vested interests in govt and CS that could destabilise SAVI's take-off • State Security Structures are adequately informed on SAVI's role and objectives • Key partners including other SLPs and DFID present an accurate overview of SAVI's role to CS, govt, and media in SAVI states
<p><i>(2. Effective evidence-based advocacy by civil society established)</i></p> <p>2.1 assessment of state level partners KM, Comms/Advocacy and M&E capacity through S-DOC studies – capacity assessments</p> <p>2.2 develop strategy for and support state partners in CS (for legacy and initial advocacy projects) to develop their own KM, M&E and Communications Strategies</p> <p>2.3 support partners to develop work plans, budgets, capacity building plans for selected advocacy projects</p> <p>2.4 informing the media of alternative approaches to serving public interests through advocacy and more effective use of the media</p> <p>2.5 identify capacity building inputs and partners to provide required organisational and/or technical assistance to selected media organisations in each state</p> <p>2.6 support selected media to strengthen design & delivery of public orientation programmes on role of SHAs, where existing, in each state</p>		

<p>(Newage Network to lead)</p> <p>2.7 review findings of S-DOC analysis with selected Gov Policy Monitoring & Research (GPRM)s in each state</p> <p>2.8 work with GPMRs to identify issue-based policy monitoring & research activities in each state (possibly linked to SPARC & other SLPs' activities/issues (inter-sectoral nodes)</p>		
<p><i>(3. Responsiveness, accountability and capability of State Houses of Assembly increased)</i></p> <p>3.1 general capacity and needs assessments (linked to SPARC's SEAT tools) of SHAs in each state (thru S-DOC studies)</p> <p>3.2 initial SHA capacity building in ≥ 1 state, in partnership with SPARC (training on PFM) starting in Kaduna</p> <p>3.3 support to review and redesign of SHA induction programme in each state</p> <p>3.4 review findings of S-DOC analysis with SHA members in each state (pilot in Kaduna)</p> <p>3.5 support to mentoring and capacity building of selected partners for technical assistance to SHAs</p> <p>3.6 support selected partners to develop work plans, budgets for SHA capacity building inputs</p> <p>3.7 consultation with Members on constituency project funding processes towards development of a support strategy for SHA</p>		

<p>constituency outreach work</p> <p>3.8 support to verification (technical feasibility) of issue-based constituency outreach programmes (only if found to be feasible)</p> <p>3.9 identify capacity building inputs and partners to provide required organisational and/or technical assistance to selected government policy monitoring & research (GPMR) bodies in each state</p> <p>3.10 support selected partners to develop work plans, budgets for GPMR capacity building inputs</p>		
<p><i>(4. More inclusive civil society constituencies established)</i></p> <p>4.1 broad mapping and engagement of CS to cover wide level and diverse range of CS actors – organisations, individuals, registered, informal groups</p> <p>4.2 identification and analysis of gender & social exclusion issues through the S-DOC studies: CSO mapping, PE analysis and capacity assessments, and through engagement with existing CS platforms for dialogue with govt</p> <p>4.3 gender & social exclusion analysis – development of a pro-action framework – to highlight programmatic opportunities and constraints to addressing identified gender & social exclusion issues</p> <p>4.4 initial demonstration of more inclusive and diverse state level CS structures through establishment & capacity building of SAVI State Advisory Panels (SAPs) & Technical Executive Committees (TECs)</p>		
<p><u>Supporting Activities</u></p>		

<p><i>A. Programme Management & Development</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. mobilisation of core team and recruitment of staff 2. establishment of offices, processes and procedures 3. establishment of technical and financial report systems 4. support to team building at State - HQ level (SWOT analysis) and capacity building for core team & state teams 5. support to financial admin training 6. support to driver skills training 7. support to establishment of State and Abuja Offices 8. support to overall S-DOC process 9. support to political economy & stakeholder analysis 10. support to capacity/needs assessment and plans 11. support to SAVI core lead TA to adapt GRM & others' fund mgt procedures manuals for SAVI advocacy projects & small grant funding mechanisms: 		
<p><i>B. Programme Co-ordination</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. consultations with DFID, other SLPs and other development partners on major design/activity changes and key issues arising at programme & state level resulting from inception planning, S- 		

<p>DOC studies and baseline surveys</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. SLP co-ordination through monthly PMs meetings and periodic events, as well as meetings of technical sub-groups, and DFID quarterly co-ordination meetings and periodic reviews 3. coordinated development of SAVI & SLP oversight structures 4. support to discrete co-ordination between SAVI & SPARC, other SLPs, on issue-based policy monitoring & research activities in each state ??? 		
<p><i>C. Programme KM, M&E & Communications</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. support to M&E logframe development process 2. support to M&E logframe development - harmonise states & SLP 3. support to collective SLP KM & Comms systems (web-based intranet & internet): TA share with SPARC 4. support to harmonise SAVI consortium KM & Comms systems (web-pages) as well as corporate compatibility 5. support to SAVI team building and inter-state cross-learning mechanisms 6. support to SAVI's development of its corporate image 7. develop strategy & communications products for public launch of SAVI in all the states and at the national level 8. develop strategy & communications products for 'understanding 		

SAVI' within SAVI team & SLPs, and for orientation of new staff		
-----------------------------------------------------------------	--	--