A NOTE ON THE LOGFRAME AS A FLEXIBLE TOOL

Indicators for Safety, Security and access to justice (SSAJ)

February 2003

Philippa Haden

The Performance Assessment Resource Centre
is managed by
International Organisation Development Ltd

www.parcinfo.org
www.iod.uk.com

A NOTE ON THE LOGFRAME AS A FLEXIBLE TOOL

<u>Introduction</u>

The following note has been prepared to set the scene for the process of developing indicators throughout the life cycle of programme design and delivery. This paper is an example of how the journey can take place, and represents a simplified version of the complex reality. Different elements of a programme's development may happen at different times, and the output/outcome components of Stages 3 and 4 in particular may be interchangeable. They should be seen as building blocks that may be sequenced in one way or another. The real challenge is to seek out a small set of globally applicable SSAJ indicators that gain international recognition and help to drive the SSAJ agenda forward. However, some contextual indicators should and will change through the life cycle of a programme, in order to keep the fundamental over-arching principles of pro-poor justice sector reform in a central position in that country. This needs to happen in the context of steadily increasing understanding developed by the programme personnel, and in response to broader changes in the overall environment. Indicators will therefore be more flexible, but it is important to note that there must be some indicator consistency throughout the programme.

STAGE 1: Scoping

During the Scoping phase, DFID staff (and consultants) look for indicators to make the case that DFID should be working in the SSAJ arena in-country. The logic is summarised within the Project Concept Note.

STAGE 2: Design & Appraisal

The design phase sets the fundamental base for programme outcomes and outputs, and the accompanying indicators represent an important part of the analysis for project approval in the DFID system. The resulting logframe provides the basis for analysing the size of the commitment, the risks involved, and the opportunity for contractors to bid.

STAGE 3: The Inception Phase – "The Reality Check"
(DFID logframe with stakeholder input):

Outcomes (and Indicators) are related to:
  a) Understanding the reality of the components of the SSAJ sector through the baseline mapping of relevant areas of the sector
  b) Increased dialogue and engagement with key stakeholders across the sector, moving towards shared understanding of the broad programme objectives
  c) Establishment or enhancement of optimal relationships with other donors in country involved in the sector, ideally linking at least partially through the PRS process (if there is a PRS process in-country)

d) Identification or inauguration of a relevant body on the host side that brings the sector together, to be a main point of dialogue for the overall programme and sectoral strategy development

Outputs (and Indicators) are related to:

i) A contextually valid map of the sector, including the institutional landscape of formal institutions, connections and links with the informal sector, including the nature of the customary/traditional justice being practised

ii) Baselines on the sector and poor and vulnerable people's SSAJ perceptions

iii) The institutionalisation of future information collection, building on and feeding into existing information sources (ie laying foundations for relationships of Stage 4)

iv) Preliminary analysis of potential areas for "joined-up" working – at all levels – overarching legal framework, identifying points of pressure and linkages between police, courts and prisons and quantifying these. Also, preliminary analysis of local level, informal interventions which could relieve pressure on the formal sector

v) Deepened understanding of poor people's priorities in terms of achieving access to justice in target geographical areas (linkage with specific concerns - land tenure / agrarian reform / health services / education?)

Stage 3 sets the scene for the programme, deepening and **sharing understanding** of the national context, putting flesh onto the bones of the design logframe, and indeed questioning the assumptions contained in the design logframe in the light of experience. It constitutes an intensive data gathering phase for baseline establishment, using quantitative and qualitative information sources, against which the programme can be monitored effectively. It also investigates the current data collection mechanisms, and establishes priority areas for improvement. It provides an indication of what is going to be cost-effective in terms of the reality of sustainable data collection. In programme terms, this may mean the prioritisation of certain indicators over others, and a reality check on what is possible in information management terms. The indicators will almost certainly change at the end of this stage, and the change will be a process of negotiation between the key actors in the programme. The logframe will remain a "live" document.

STAGE 4: Engagement and Dialogue to Build Consensus
(Jointly agreed logframe; host and donor)

Outcomes (and Indicators) are related to:

a) Effective dissemination of the baseline information and perceptions for increased understanding at all levels regarding barriers to feelings of safety, access to justice, and just treatment within the system

b) Stimulating demand for information (civil society to institutions and within institutions)

c) Strengthening extent of engagement of key actors in the above, (from sectoral institutions and related non-government bodies)

    d) Increasing ownership of change indicators and interim targets
    e) Continuing relationship building and deepening of dialogue
    f) Transparency in the reform agenda

Outputs (and Indicators) are related to:

    i)   Communication strategies for information dissemination – use of national and local media and CSOs already involved – rights based approaches to dissemination
    ii)   Identification of possible "change agents" or "champions of reform" within formal institutions and beyond
    iii)   Institutional change focus identified within key institutions such as the police, judiciary, prisons
    iv)   Piloting innovative projects connecting informal and formal systems where possible, to avoid duplication of effort
    v)   Cross-learning with other SSAJ programmes to stimulate the SSAJ idea

Stage 4 disseminates the messages coming out of the information collected under Stage 3 within the context of sectoral, pro-poor thinking. This stage is about the creation of demand for change at as many levels as possible. The "change agenda" may focus on the formal institutional actors of SSAJ, ie the "state supply side", but should include the traditional and customary areas, and the needs expressed by poor and vulnerable groups ("demand side").

STAGE 5: Common Understanding and Prioritisation of the Change Agenda
(Evolving logframe as and when necessary)

Outcomes (and Indicators) are related to:

    a) A process of negotiated understanding, (based on the information and experience of stages 3 & 4) to highlight the key "entry points" for reform
    b) Prioritisation of objectives
    c) Ownership of the programme objectives by the host GO and other key institutions and actors involved
    d) Acceptance by government of NGO data sources establishing a level playing field of information sources
    e) The possibility of innovative extra-institutional ideas

STAGE 6: Review

Outcomes (and Indicators) are related to:

    a) What are the policy changes emerging?
    b) What is the justification for continuing with the programme?
    c) What are the next steps?
    d) What internationally applicable lessons are emerging?