

**Madhya Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project Phase 2
July 2007 – June 2012**

Annex 1: Logical Framework¹

Narrative Summary	Verifiable Indicators (by end of project unless otherwise specified)	Means of verification	Risks and assumptions
<p>Goal Livelihoods of poor rural people in Madhya Pradesh sustainably enhanced</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in numbers of men and women below the poverty line. • Positive change in State/District human development indicators. • Improved access to and use of services and schemes by poor households 	<p>Madhya Pradesh Human Development Report. BPL data Household surveys including NSS rounds and commissioned district level surveys Poverty and social impact assessments.</p>	

¹ Target percentages will be reviewed during the Inception Phase and the first annual review mission.

Madhya Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Programme Phase 2
Annex 1: Logical Framework
07/02/2009

<p>Purpose Effective policies, institutions, and programmes that sustainably enhance the livelihoods of poor rural people in tribal districts of Madhya Pradesh (MP).</p>	<p>1. Coherence in rural development policies and strategies in MP, which translate into pro-poor budget allocations and services.</p> <p>2. Demonstrated that Gram Sabhas can operate as organizationally and fiscally viable local institutions, able to allocate resources and influence to strengthen livelihoods of poor people.</p> <p>3. 50% of Below Poverty Line (BPL) households in project Tribal areas with increased incomes; more diversified income sources; improved food security; impact reaches the poorest 20% of the population and female-headed households.</p>	<p>State reports and budgets. Policy documents of Gol and GoMP. State Livelihoods Forum Reports.</p> <p>Independent social audit reports, carried out under the Department of Panchayati Raj and Rural Development.</p> <p>Impact assessments carried out against baseline and control areas (2009 and 2012). Programme reviews and evaluation reports. Specific studies tracking impact on female headed households and poorest 20% of target population.</p>	<p>No major external fiscal shock.</p> <p>No major natural disasters.</p> <p>Political commitment to prioritise public expenditure on pro-poor sectors.</p> <p>GoMP integrates lessons and evidence into rural development policy making.</p> <p>GoMP continues to support PRIs in terms of their role in decision making, and resource allocations.</p>
<p>Outputs</p>			
<p>1. Enhanced capacities of GS to plan and manage resources in a transparent, effective and accountable manner in response to community driven demands.</p>	<p>1.1 80% of Gram Sabhas in target areas have regular participation of bottom 20% of BPL households at village assembly and committee level;</p> <p>1.2 80% Gram Sabha who identify the poorest and take action to respond to their specific needs.</p> <p>1.3 50% BPL know the legal roles and provisions of the Gram Sabha and can explain how funding mechanisms work.</p> <p>1.4 80% of Gram Sabhas manage and use village funds (Gram Kosh) in transparent, socially responsible and equitable ways;</p> <p>1.5 80% of Gram Sabhas actively engaged in drawing up, implementing and monitoring micro-plans; plans enable convergence between different programmes;</p> <p>1.6 Department of Panchayati Raj institutionalize regular financial and social audits of Gram Sabhas.</p> <p>1.7 40% leadership role within Gram Sabhas fulfilled by women;</p>	<p>SPMU and district level documentation, using both qualitative and quantitative data.</p> <p>BPL surveys.</p> <p>2006 and mid term assessment of financial management capacities of Gram Sabhas.</p> <p>Programme evaluations</p> <p>Regular social and spot audits.</p> <p>Department of Panchayati Raj annual reports.</p> <p>Annual perceptions survey of transparency of GS and</p>	<p>Broader capacity initiatives for PRIs continue through other central/state programmes.</p> <p>Decentralisation is able to promote increased accountability and transparency in the use of funds at village levels.</p>

Madhya Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Programme Phase 2
Annex 1: Logical Framework
07/02/2009

	women's issues reflected in Gram Sabha decisions.	responsiveness of service providers.	
2. Improved access to assets, employment and services that support the livelihoods of over 3 million rural poor people.	<p>2.1 70% of BPL households in project areas with improved access and utilization of services, through more responsive and pro poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial services (credit, savings, insurance, remittances) ▪ Non Timber Forest Products (NTFP) and non-farm income generation ▪ Livestock and crop development; <p>2.2 60% of migrant households with improved access to job and wage related information; and information on entitlements and services.</p> <p>2.3 At least three documented examples of more effective and innovative NRM (grazing and forestry), which enhance livelihoods of the poorest, particularly women, and can be replicated and scaled up;</p> <p>2.4 Quality of Natural Resource base maintained in target areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% decrease in area of unproductive wasteland; • 10% increase in area under cultivation through water harvesting or supplementary irrigation; • No decrease in availability NTFPs and area of forest. <p>2.6 60% BPL households with improved access to water for safe drinking and irrigation.</p>	<p>State poverty assessment reports.</p> <p>Detailed impact reports provided by partners (eg on financial services).</p> <p>Periodic evaluation reports against 2005 and 2006 MPRLP baselines.</p> <p>Line department strategies and reports.</p> <p>Specific programme monitoring and impact reports from partners implementing the sub-component; data for control areas collected and compared.</p> <p><u>DPSU</u> Environmental Monitoring reports.</p>	<p>Commitment within GoMP to take up successful innovations and replicate elsewhere as appropriate.</p> <p>Increased demand, combined with transfer of skills, translates into improved basic service provision.</p> <p>Capacity improvements generated in livelihoods service providers are sustained.</p>
3. Effective mechanisms for social protection which reduce vulnerability and build assets of the poorest, and reduce constraints to productive activity.	<p>3.1 At least two innovative social protection mechanisms piloted, in order to feed lessons into State level policy/practice.</p> <p>3.2 Mechanisms for identifying the poorest and most excluded are refined, tested and implemented and used to steer MPRLP Phase 2 to focus on poorest.</p> <p>3.3 20% of migrant households able to access specific initiatives (PDS, primary schooling, basic health care).</p> <p>3.4 BPL lists refined in target villages to reduce errors of</p>	<p>SPMU reports. Evaluation reports.</p> <p>State Livelihoods Forum reports.</p> <p>BPL lists held by Gram Panchayats and at District levels.</p> <p>MPREGS/SPMU reports</p>	

	<p>exclusion/inclusion.</p> <p>3.5 80% BPL households able to access their full entitlements under specific schemes (PDS, pensions, MPREGS)</p> <p>3.6 80% Gram Sabhas implementing MPREGS effectively (technical quality of works; public assets which benefit poor people; application of minimum wage and gender provisions under the NREG Act).</p>	Impact assessments, comparing with control areas.	
4. Women and men have equitable access to and benefit from resources, decision-making and opportunities to enhance livelihoods.	<p>4.1 Comprehensive Gender and Social Inclusion Strategy/ Operational plan implemented and reviewed regularly.</p> <p>4.2 50% of poor women in target areas feel more empowered².</p> <p>4.3 Gender issues mainstreamed at Gram Sabha level, within Project Facilitation Teams (PFTs) and programme management structures and human resource management.</p>	<p>SPMU documentation</p> <p>Impact assessment reports 2010 and 2013.</p> <p>Annual Reviews</p>	MPRLP able to attract, induct, train and retain capable and experienced staff with skills to engage on gender and inclusion issues at the grass roots, as well as at district and state levels.
5. Programme results, methodologies and structures inform State and Central level programmes and policies.	<p>5.1 Appropriate programme management systems and structures in place (end of 2007) and reviewed on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>5.2 Experience documented and shared with MoRD/GoMP decision-makers on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empowering GS in tribal areas to plan and prioritise development interventions; • Targeting mechanisms and strengthening of BPL selection. • participatory gender sensitive and inclusive planning process • effectiveness of different social protection mechanisms, • replicable models for pro-poor service delivery for enhancing livelihoods and for improved natural resource management; • recognition of positive aspects of migration with 	<p>Annual reviews.</p> <p>Minutes of Empowered Committee; reports by State Livelihoods Forum.</p>	<p>Policy and decision makers maintain space for engagement of MPRLP and stakeholders in policy design and formulation.</p> <p>Policy makers and officials have incentives to use the outputs from the Livelihoods Forum.</p> <p>Useful lessons and evidence can be generated and applied in the given time scale.</p>

² Sub-indicators would be defined by women themselves, but from existing MPRLP experience might include greater voice of women in family decisions, sharing of social reproduction role; changes in mobility of women; self image and confidence to deal with external institutions (eg banks, line departments, and other institutions).

