



An IPARL System for CEPA

The Global AIDS Alliance (GAA) and its African-based partners with support from The Children's Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF) have launched a multi-year global networked advocacy Campaign to End Pediatric HIV/AIDS (CEPA). The overarching goal of the campaign is to overcome key policy and implementation bottlenecks that have historically impeded the scaling up of pediatric prevention, treatment, and care in sub-Saharan Africa.

The Need

A complex and dynamic local-to-global networked advocacy campaign such as CEPA requires a continuous monitoring and learning system that:

- 1) Promotes real-time learning and sharing to identify and overcome policy and implementation bottlenecks
- 2) Concretely ties evaluation to strategy development
- 3) Gathers consistent comparable data at multiple levels and across activity streams

The Response

iScale's Impacts Planning, Assessment, Reporting, and Learning (IPARL) system (developed by its two founding partner organizations Keystone and GAN-Net) cohesively ties together a range of activities including: advocacy planning, data gathering and monitoring, data analysis and evaluation, action learning, and reporting. It serves as an internal *and* external communications and accountability mechanism across a range of stakeholders, a basis for strategic planning, and can inform future programs and investments. An IPARL system that matches CEPA's specific needs will include the following components:

- A. Clearly Articulated CEPA-Wide Strategy (Theory of Change)** – The overall campaign level strategy describes WHAT CEPA plans to achieve and HOW it plans to achieve it. It provides a framework to coordinate partner level action. The CEPA-wide strategy should include a description of the various partner strategies needed and a set of indicators that can be used to track progress and make real-time course corrections at the campaign level.
- B. Clearly articulated regional and national level strategies for CEPA partners (Theories of Action)** – The CEPA-wide strategy articulates how collective action leads to the campaign's desired impact while regional and national level strategies describe an individual partner's action plan. Regional and national level strategies articulate the specific outcomes an individual partner plans to achieve and how such objectives support broader CEPA level impacts. A complete regional or national level strategy also: explains the key bottlenecks that are preventing their outcomes from being achieved; describes the strategies an individual partner will use to overcome these bottlenecks and achieve their outcomes; identifies a set of indicators for progress tracking and course correction; and describes the other relevant actors and factors that affect their outcomes either positively or negatively.

- C. An Integrated Assessment Framework** – An integrated assessment framework

programs and investment as a way to maximize impact. Example activities include: 1) Review and discussion of monitoring reports, scorecards and data, 2) Policymaker Ratings and 3) Intense Period Debriefs.

F. Constituency Voice and Feedback – Effective mechanisms for constituency voice involve collecting views and feedback from the CEPA constituents on an ongoing basis combined with constituency dialogue processes. Constituency voice:

- Provides new insight about effects on key constituents, can inform the campaign's assessments of its efforts, and help it to course correct.
- Informs the campaign's understanding of important, new aspects of its performance.
- Empowers constituents by amplifying their voice. The process gives constituents a new opportunity to participate in the campaign and increase their sense of stake in it.
- Helps the campaign grow in legitimacy as a result of its visible efforts to be accountable to its constituents.

G. CEPA Network Communications Platform – The design of a CEPA network communications platform is critical, as it must support the collection of monitoring and evaluation data, constituency feedback, reporting, as well as learning and course correction. The same platform will include the broader CEPA network communication needs to create an entire, holistic CEPA network communications platform for the sharing of information in a rich and social environment. The platform will support the entry, collection, and reporting of M&E data as well as, for example, partner stories, discussions, and joint collaboration on document creation. The platform will be designed taking a user-centered approach, so as to build a system that meets the needs of CEPA partners and their common work practices.

A Dashboard of Potential Global and Country-Level KPIs – Final KPIs will be aligned with the CEPA overall strategy and the specific National Advocacy Action Plans.

Outcomes	Measurement Associated with Outcomes
SOCIETY LEVEL	
<u>Policy-Level Change</u>	Budget allocation
	Budget disbursements
	Policy agendas/framing
	Policy formulation
	Policy adoption
	Policy implementation
	Policy enforcement
	Policy compliance
<u>Exposure/Penetration</u>	Level of public involvement in an issue
	Changes in voting behaviour (legislative and citizen)
	Breadth of partners supporting an issue (e.g., number of “unlikely allies” supporting an issue)
	Extent of media coverage (e.g., quantity, prioritization, extent of coverage, variety of media “beats,” message echoing)
	Awareness of campaign principles and messages among influential groups (e.g., policy makers, general public, opinion leaders)
<u>Problem Solution</u>	Public perception that the problem is being solved
	Removal or minimization of key bottlenecks/barriers to problem solution
<u>Shifts in Norms</u>	Increased agreement on the problem and solution definition
	Changes in beliefs and values
	Changes in policies and laws
	Changes in the salience of an issue
NETWORK LEVEL	
Network Effectiveness	Robust governance, participation and norms
	Member alignment and commitment to network
	Size, growth and reach of network
	Density in exchange of information, communication and services
	Degree of coordination among network members

RAPID ADVOCACY LEARNING ACTIVITIES				
Tools	Purpose and Scope	Method	Strengths	Target User
Bellwether Methodology	Determines where a policy issue or proposal is positioned in the policy agenda queue, how decision makers and other influential actors are thinking and talking about it, and how likely they are to act on it.	Structured interviews with “bellwethers” or influential people in the public and private sectors who are unaware before the interview begins that the questions will focus specifically on the policy issue of interest. They are informed about what the interview will generally cover, but do not receive specific details.	<p>Tool returns both summative and formative data.</p> <p>Method is repeatable over time if the advocacy strategy takes place over multiple years.</p> <p>Contributes to real-time learning and informs user of appropriate strategies and messaging.</p>	<p>Advocacy Evaluation</p> <p>Communications</p>
Policymaker Ratings	Method for gauging political will or support for a particular advocacy issue or proposal among a defined group of policymakers (e.g., legislature, council, etc.).	Advocates rate policy-makers of interest on a series of three scales that assess: policymaker level of support; policymaker level of influence; and advocates’ level of confidence	Method is repeatable over time to determine whether and how indicators shift.	Advocacy Evaluation (issue support)
Intense Period Debriefs	Engages advocates in evaluative inquiry shortly after a policy window or intense period of action occurs	“After action review” – It captures: the public mood/political context during policy window; what happened and how the members responded to events; perspective on outcome(s) achieved/not achieved; and how strategies might be adjusted in hindsight	Gather in-depth and real-time information in a targeted, practical, and respectful way.	Advocacy evaluation
Advocacy Pre-mortem	Based on concept of prospective hindsight, which involves imagining an event already has occurred	<p>Takes place at beginning of an advocacy effort and involves exercise that assumes effort has failed (not that it might fail, but that it indeed has failed).</p> <p>Advocates and any other stakeholder involved in the advocacy effort are tasked with identifying possible reasons for the effort’s failure.</p>	<p>Comprehensive list of risks that an advocacy effort should be cognizant of and monitor. It also is a list that the evaluation can use as a guide in its inquiry.</p> <p>Participatory process</p>	Originally intended for private sector but can be applied to advocacy evaluations