

## Annex B: Proposed revision to the G-rap Logical Framework

Objectives	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Means of Verification (MoVs)	Assumptions and Risks
<p><u>Super-goal:</u> Changes in the lives of poor people)</p> <p><b>Poverty is reduced in Ghana</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RAOs' assessments of the social impact of specific policies on poor communities. (a voluntary activity, not a condition of G-rap funding)</li> <li>• Studies and surveys of poverty by third parties, as identified by grantees and PMT.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RAO's six monthly narrative progress reports submitted to G-rap PMT</li> <li>• G-rap website</li> <li>• G-rap newsletter to RAOs</li> </ul>	NA
<p><u>Goal:</u> (Changes in Government behaviour)</p> <p><b>Existing and new government policies are made more pro-poor.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Named government policies being addressed by each grantee (the more specific the description the better e.g. Trust bill).</li> <li>• RAOs judgements of what they think was the single "most significant change"<sup>1</sup> in government policy and practice, in each six monthly reporting period. Including the rationale for their choices.</li> <li>• PMT' selection of the "most significant change" in government policy and practice, from amongst those reported by RAOs, along with the rationale for this selection</li> <li>• Impact assessment of the collective efforts of G-rap funded RAOs between 2006 and 2009, via four purposely selected case studies of policy changes, as described in paras 8-9 the November 2008 M&amp;E Visit Report by Davies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RAO's six monthly narrative progress reports submitted to G-rap PMT</li> <li>• G-rap website, using above source</li> <li>• G-rap website, using above source</li> <li>• An independent end-of phase 1 impact assessment study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption: RAOs address all stages of the policy making process, including policy design, approval, budgeting, implementation and revision</li> </ul>
<p><u>Purpose:</u> (Changes in RAO behaviour)</p> <p><b>1. RAOs are more effective in their relationships with government</b></p> <p><b>2. RAOs are more</b></p>	<p>§ Indicators as individually identified by each RAO when negotiating a funding agreement with G-rap (both first and subsequent agreements), for each of the three areas of change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Including RAO's weighting of their own indicators, to enable Raos to create their own overall performance scores, to be tracked over time</li> </ul>	<p>§ Funding agreements between individual RAOs and G-rap</p> <p>§ RAO's six monthly narrative progress reports submitted to G-rap PMT</p> <p>§ G-rap website, using above</p>	<p>§ Assumption: RAOs' increased autonomy will contribute to their increased effectiveness (i.e. their ability to affect changes in government policy)</p> <p>§ Risk: GoG introduces a (NGO) Trust bill that gives it extensive</p>

<sup>1</sup> For more information on this method of "monitoring without indicators" see <http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.htm>

<sup>2</sup> For more information on this method of "monitoring without indicators" see <http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.htm>

## Annex B: Proposed revision to the G-rap Logical Framework

<p><b>effective in using <i>their relationship with other actors to help affect changes in government policies.</i></b></p> <p><b>3. RAOs make continued improvements to <i>their own management</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Both processes being subject to vetting by the PMT at the beginning of their original and renewed funding agreements with G-rap.</li> <li>§ RAOs judgements of what they think was the single “most significant change”<sup>2</sup> in each of these three areas, in each six monthly reporting period. Including the rationale for their choices.</li> <li>§ Stakeholder opinions of the work of RAOs, re each of the three objectives (and including name and issue recognition, perceived credibility and usefulness)</li> <li>§ Website visitor responses via “visitor comment” facility on pages of website reporting on these three objectives</li> <li>§ (Re objective 2) Names of all issue coalitions that RAOs report being involved with, and the depth of detail they provide on these</li> <li>§ (Re objective 3) A gender equity commitment analysis of each RAO’s management (e.g. disaggregated data, programming etc)</li> </ul>	<p>sources</p> <p>§ Annual stakeholder opinion surveys, commissioned by G-rap. Focused on government officials and other targets of RAO campaigning and advocacy work</p> <p>§ Independent annual survey commissioned by G-rap</p>	<p>control over NGO activities, and this inhibits the advocacy work of RAOs in particular</p>
--	--	--	---

## Annex B: Proposed revision to the G-rap Logical Framework

Objectives	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Means of Verification (MoVs)	Assumptions and risks
<p><u>Output</u> (Services provided by G-rap to others)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide core funding to individual RAOs</li> <li>2. Funding coalitions via the Strategic Initiatives Fund (SIF)</li> <li>3. Coaching grantees on fiduciary risk control</li> <li>4. Support to peer review processes</li> <li>5. Make information about RAO plans, activities and achievements publicly available</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount provided, number of grantees, RAOs' outcomes relative to predictions</li> <li>• Amount provided, number of grantees, grantees' outcomes relative to predictions</li> <li>• Number and % of auditors' recommendations implemented</li> <li>• Number and % of peer review recommendations implemented</li> <li>• Growth in website visits &amp; downloads / newsletter membership numbers, email inquiries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G-rap PMT six monthly reports</li> <li>• G-rap website</li> <li>• Auditors' reports</li> <li>• Peer review reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption: Core funding will increase RAOs' autonomy</li> <li>• Assumption: Increased public transparency will adequately compensate for the absence of intensive and prescribed forms of monitoring of RAO activities by the PMT</li> <li>• Risk: RAOs do not accept independent checking of their self-identified indicators, and / or peer review of their performance against these indicators. They become unaccountable for their performance, and this negatively effects their work</li> </ul>
<p><u>Activities:</u> (Management activities within PMT)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Call for grant applications and shortlisting</li> <li>2. Process grant applications and contracts</li> <li>3. Contracting technical assistance</li> <li>4. Processing of RAOs narrative and financial reports</li> <li>5. Production of regular financial and progress reports to Board,</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of applicants, quality and relevance of the applications</li> <li>• Time taken to process applications. (Will need to include time to check proposed indicators)</li> <li>• Timeliness, ability to deliver as per ToRs</li> <li>• Time taken to provide feedback to RAOs</li> <li>• Time taken, feedback on reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G-rap PMT six monthly reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

## Annex B: Proposed revision to the G-rap Logical Framework

<p>Committee and contractor</p> <p>6. Management of conventions, website and newsletters</p> <p>7. Monitoring of attention to gender in G-rap management processes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency of updates of website, frequency and timeliness of newsletter.</li> <li>• A weighted gender checklist for overall management, enabling construction of an overall performance score</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A specific section of G-rap PMT six monthly reports</li> </ul>	
<p><u>Inputs:</u> (Support provided by Programme Board (and sub-committee) and Funders Committee)</p> <p>1. Timely provision of pooled funds</p> <p>2. Advise PMT on strategic direction</p> <p>3. Management of annual review, and end-of-Phase 1 impact assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeliness of provision of funding, and reduction of complexity of the procedures involved</li> <li>• Facilitation of the Strategic Issues Meetings (SIMs) including documentation of process and outcomes</li> <li>• Breadth of consultation on ToRs and draft reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G-rap PMT six monthly reports</li> <li>• Report on SIMs</li> <li>• G-rap PMT six monthly reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption: G-rap committees are willing to be as accountable for their performance as the PMT and G-rap grantees.</li> </ul>