

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK GOLD PROJECT

Project Title: Governance for Local Development (GOLD)

Date: FY 2016 - 2020

If local governance stakeholders' capacity to manage and mobilize communal resources effectively and collaboratively is strengthened, then service delivery will improve.

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
Purpose: Effective local governance strengthened	1. Governance Score at sub-national level in targeted service sectors (Custom indicator; using GGB) a. Health b. Education c. WASH d. Food Security 2. Number of sub-national entities receiving USG assistance that improve their performance (Standard 2.2.3-5) 3. Percentage change in the amount of resources allocated to CL's priority basic social services (disaggregated by Health, Education, Food Security, WASH) (Custom Indicator) 4. Number of public policies introduced, adopted, repealed, changed or implemented consistent with citizen input (Standard Indicator – 2.4.1-12)	• Assessment reports • Review of implementing partner reports • Field visit reports • GGB • GOS Data • Surveys	• The Mission is able to mobilize resources to support GOLD program activities. • The second phase of Act III of decentralization is adopted and enacted • 2017 elections do not derail government plans for decentralization. • Public sector actors maintain engagement/commitments regardless of 2017 elections. For Health Services: • Strong political-will exists to enact health sector reforms that will further strengthen institutional capacities • The GOS will continue to prioritize UHC supporting vulnerable and poor populations as a means of ensuring improved access to health services • The GOS plan for decentralization in the health sector will be implemented by: signing of the Decret de Repartition des Services 7 , district reform and the creation of regional directorates • The MOH will provide technical assistance to regional recipients of subawards to address

			underperforming indicators • MOH capacity will continue The situation in Casamance is stable enough to implement activities
Result 1: Capacity of local government to respond to citizen demand increased	1. Percentage of decentralized government entities that generate manage and execute funds for health, education, food security, and wash (Custom Indicator) 2. Percentage increase of the contribution of local government entities allocated and spent for health, education, and WASH services (Custom Indicator) 3. <i>Number of out of school youth supported by project who re-enter formal system *</i> 4. <i>Number of people gaining access to an improved drinking water source*</i> 5. <i>Under five mortality rate; Neonatal mortality rate; Maternal mortality rate; Total fertility rate; HIV prevalence; Prevalence of under-five stunting*</i>	• Review of implementing partner reports • Field Visit Reports • GOS Data • Data from Other Sector Offices	• The transfer of fiscal decentralization funds to CLs is increases, even if only progressively. • Timeliness in transfer of funds improves, even if only progressively. • The level of commitment identified during design field trips and assessments is sustained among at least select CLs, who can be a model for other target CLs.
Sub-result 1.1: Leadership Capacity of CL councilors as elected representatives improved	1. Percentage of local officials who have completed the required training for their roles as specified by the Government of Senegal (Custom Indicator) 2. Number of CLs holding regular meetings with civil society groups/associations to discuss health, education, wash and food security issues and performance (Custom Indicator) 3. Number of individuals who received USG-assisted training, including management skills and fiscal management, to strengthen local government and/or decentralization (Standard Indicator – 2.2.3-1)	• Local government Data • Review of implementing partner reports	
Sub-result 1.2: Strengthened organizational capacity (planning, budgeting, and implementation processes) of decentralized government structures	4. Number of local government entities who received USG assisted training including, management skills, and fiscal management, to strengthen local governance system (Custom Indicator) 5. <i>Number of local governments that have the</i>	• Review of implementing partner reports • Field Visit	

	<i>technical skills to plan for and procure water and sanitation services (Custom Indicator)*</i> 6. Number of local governments in targeted regions that have accessed financing for water and/or sanitation services (Custom Indicator) 7. Number of: ○ School Management Committees ○ Health Management Committees ○ Water user associations ○ Water Management Operators ○ NR Exploitation operators that applied new management practices as a result of USG assistance (Custom Indicator) 8. Number of management committees that complete capacity building on engaging their respective constituency (Custom Indicator) 9. Number of local government structures/districts holding quarterly health, WASH, food security, education sector planning meetings(Custom Indicator)	Reports • GOS Data • Data from Other Sector Offices	
Sub-result 1.3: Public financial management and oversight of public expenditures improved	1. Number of local government entities who received USG assisted training in transparent fiscal management to strengthen local governance system (Custom Indicator) 2. Number of CLs with financial plans for health, education, food security, and WASH services (Custom Indicator) 3. Increased capacity of ASUFORs to manage water services (Custom Indicator) 4. Number of Comités de Santé that develop and implement a costed action plan to oversee health service delivery at the community and facility level (Custom Indicator)	• Review of implementing partner reports • Field Visit Reports • GOS Data • Data from Other Sector Offices	

Sub-result 1.4: Own-source revenue of CLs increased	5. Number of sub-national governments receiving USG assistance to increase their annual own-source revenues (Standard Indicator – 2.2.3-6) 6. Percentage of decentralized government entities that generate and execute own funds for health, education, WASH, and food security (Custom Indicator)	• Review of implementing partner reports • Field Visit Reports • GOS Data • Data from Other Sector Offices	
Sub-result 1.5: USAID activities are better integrated in CL planning and budgeting	1. Percentage of USAID IPs' workplans in targeted location reflected in partner CLs' local development plans (Custom Indicator) 2. Percentage of local development planning meetings led by the CLs themselves (Custom Indicator)		
Result 2: Enabling environment for the accountable management and collection of public resources improved	1. Number of USG supported functional accountability mechanisms introduced that enable citizen feedback and government response (Custom Indicator) 2. Number of media messages making citizens aware of, and promoting the use of, basic services being provided (disaggregated by health, education, food security, WASH sectors; Custom Indicator) 3. Percentage of collective campaigns ¹ on behalf of citizens that effectively increase public awareness (Custom Indicator) 4. <i>Number of advocacy campaigns organized by NGOs and CSOs around issues of access to and retention of students in middle school*</i>	• Review of implementing partner reports • Field Visit Reports • GOS Data • Data from Other Sector Offices	• The transfer of fiscal decentralization funds to CLs is increases, even if only progressively. • Timeliness in transfer of funds improves, even if only progressively. • The level of commitment identified during design field trips and assessments is sustained among at least select CLs, who can be a model for other target CLs.
Sub-result 2.1: Opportunities for stakeholders (government, non-government, donor, etc.) to engage in dialogue on public needs improved	5. Number of multi-sectoral coordination mechanisms established and functioning at the community level held with USG assistance (Custom Indicator) 6. Number of communities holding regular meetings to discuss health, education, wash and nutrition data, issues and performance (Custom Indicator) 7. Number of USG-funded organizations representing marginalized constituencies trying to affect government policy or conducting government oversight (Standard Indicator – 2.4.1-11) 8. <i>Increased number of civil society/community organizations engaged in health advocacy</i>	• Review of implementing partner reports • Field Visit Reports • Local government Data	• Openness of local government to address the transparency challenges and to interact with CSOs. • Implementing partners use tools and methodologies that are adopted and gain buy-in from local civil society and local authorities. • Other development partners continue to coordinate rather

¹ “collective campaigns” refers to campaigns, including advocacy and sensitization activities, that stem from, or are driven via, a partnership between civil society and government groups or between several civil society organizations. This indicator gets at the quality of campaigns, rather than how many are conducted. See definition for more detail.

Sub-result 2.2: Social accountability mechanisms for service delivery transparency increased	1. Number of multi-stakeholder dialogue events held on local governance processes (Custom Indicator) 2. Number of mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use supported by USG assistance (Standard Indicator – 2.2.4-4) 3. Percentage of targeted communities utilizing social accountability tools and methodologies to oversee: • Healthcare service quality • Education service quality • WASH service quality • Food Security (Custom Indicator) 4. Number of CSOs collecting and publishing data tracking government commitments (Custom Indicator) • <i>Sample sector-specific indicators:</i> 1. <i>Number/percent of facilities displaying data on health services, including health worker roles and responsibilities, and costs</i> 2. <i>Increase in percentage of communities holding regular meetings to discuss health data, issues, facility performance</i>	• Review of implementing partner reports • Field Visit Reports • Local government Data	than try parallel processes in same regions. • Private sector operators are willing to change their management and operational practices.
Result 3: Community participation in service delivery management (Health, Education, WASH, Agriculture) increased	1. Number of management committees that develop and implement an action plan to oversee service delivery at the community and facility level (Custom Indicator, disaggregated by health, education, WASH, and Agriculture sectors) 2. Number of local mechanisms supported with USG assistance for citizens to engage their sub-national government on health, education, agriculture, and WASH service delivery and performance (Custom Indicator) 3. Number of CSOs engaged in social accountability monitoring methodologies and advocacy (Custom Indicator) 4. Percentage of women and youth organizations	• Review of implementing partner reports • Field Visit Reports • GOS Data • Data from Other Sector Offices	• Openness of local government to address the transparency challenges and to interact with CSOs. • Implementing partners use tools and methodologies that are adopted and gain buy-in from local civil society and local authorities. • Other development partners continue to coordinate rather than try parallel processes in

	involved in budget processes and service provision advocacy work (Custom Indicator) • <i>Sample sector-specific indicators:</i> 5. <i>Percent of health huts transferred to community management*</i> 6. <i>Number of classrooms built by communities*</i> 7. <i>Number of gender sensitive facilities built, rehabilitated, maintained by communities; e.g. schools, open spaces*</i>		same regions. • Communities are willing to mobilize funds and inputs for connections and other infrastructure; • Donor Coordination sufficient for effective policy dialog and delivery of essential TA/training to GOS
Sub-Result 3.1: CSOs' skills to take collective action on priority public needs ² improved	1. Number of civic actors completing technical training (including analysis and advocacy) (Custom Indicator) 2. Number of CSOs improving internal organizational capacity using USG resources (Custom Indicator)³ 3. Number of CSOs engaged in strategic planning and budget analysis (Custom Indicator) 4. Number of USG supported CSOs engaged in education, health, food security, or WASH advocacy (Custom Indicator)	• Review of implementing partner reports • Field Visit Reports • Local government Data	

* *Sample sector service delivery outcome indicators (project intends to contribute to these, but not take full responsibility for achieving these)*

² Skills referred to here are primarily analytic and in conducting advocacy.

³ Organizational capacity measured against a standard USAID-approved scale, such as the Organizational Capacity Assessment framework.