**Annex 1 – PSI Logical Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Hierarchy of objectives Strategy of Intervention*** | | *#* | ***Key Indicators*** | ***Baseline*** | ***Target*** | ***Data Sources Means of Verification*** | ***External Factors Assumptions*** |
| **Impact (Overall Goal)** | | **Impact Indicators** | |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact** | **Municipalities have a sustainable system of service management at the local level timely and efficiently responsive to the demands of citizens.** | 1. | Satisfaction rate with public services | 39% | As minimum 54% | Questionnaires, surveys  Local monitoring and evaluation system | The policy on the local government development aimed at improving the service sector |
| 2. | Increased public service coverage on local level (quantity and quality) | Project start: Zero point | At least 60% of Project municipalities (18) improved quality and coverage of services at the local level |
| 3. | The local policy on service provision is in place[[1]](#footnote-1) | Project start: Zero point | 80% of municipalities (24) have two new elements of local policy for service provision |
| 4. | The level of satisfaction with priority services[[2]](#footnote-2) delivered at the local level in project municipalities | Jalal-Abad – 32%  Issyk-Kul – 39% | As minimum:  Jalal-Abad – 47%  Issyk-Kul – 54% |
| **Outcomes** | | **Outcome Indicators** | |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1** | **Citizens enjoy sustainable cost-effective services from local service providers** | 5. | % interviewed citizens (men and women) in project municipalities who are satisfied with the quality of the selected priority services | Men – 34%  Women – 35% | As minimum:  Men – 49%  Women – 50% | Citizen survey  Citizen’s perception survey on service quality delivery | Municipal budgets allow cost tracking for individual services  Service provision is a legal obligation of LSGs |
| 6. | % of project municipalities that have improved at least one priority public service | Project start: Zero point | 60% of the Project municipalities (18), which have improved at least one priority service |
| 7. | % vulnerable citizens (women, marginalized groups and ethnic minorities) who have improved access to their prioritized local public services | Project start: Zero point | at least 30% of vulnerable citizens in Project municipalities have improved access to priority services |
| 8. | # of service providers who are cost-effective | Project start: Zero point | At least one provider is cost-effective in 60% of Project municipalities |
| **Outcome 2** | **Effective stakeholder interaction system for public service improvements is in place** | 9. | # of municipalities that have institutionalized service improvement request mechanisms for citizens | Project start: Zero point | All Project municipalities (30) adopted request mechanism for citizens in order to improve services | Council protocols, project verification  Council protocols, written replies by service providers  Municipality survey  Decisions of LSG bodies (Councils and Aiyl Okmotu) | LSGs are authorized to adopt regulations in the area of interaction with the community and in the service sector |
| 10. | # of municipalities that have institutionalized monitoring mechanisms of service providers | Project start: Zero point | All Project municipalities (30) adopted monitoring mechanism of the service providers |
| 11. | #of municipalities that are satisfied with the work of SALSGIR and the Union of LSG | 7 of 30 municipalities (SALSGIR) 3 of 30 municipalities (LSG Union) | At least 50% of the Project municipalities (15) satisfied by the work of SALSGIR and the Union of LSG |
| 12. | # of legislative changes introduced at the local level that contribute to the improvement of public services | Project start: Zero point | There is at least one NLA in every Project municipality, which contributes to service improvement at the local level |
| **Outputs (per outcome) and costs** | | **Output Indicators** | |  |  |  |  |
| **For outcome 1: Citizens enjoy sustainable cost-effective services from local service providers** | | | | | | | |
| **Output 1.1** | **The service providers on a local level practice client-oriented management behavior** | 13. | # (municipal or private) public service providers have result-based budgets in place | Project start: Zero point | At least 60% of the Project municipalities (18) have at least one service provider holding the result based-budget | Budget of service providers | No state limitations for result-based budgeting of service providers |
| 14. | # self-financed service provision schemes | Project start: Zero point | For applicable services: 100% of services |
| **Activities per output 1.1. *The service providers on a local level practice client-oriented management behavior*** | | | | | | | |
| **List of activities for output 1.1**   * Providing trainings to service providers on achievement of cost effectiveness, management and planning, defining KPIs * Providing presentation to service providers and LSGs on models of service delivery provision and awareness raising on innovative technologies   (PPPs, inter municipal cooperation, fee collection)   * Training and coaching for LSGs on formation of municipal order and local registers * Training on types of service providers contracting (external control mechanism, customer-based orientation) * Supporting LSGs in awareness raising on tariffs and fees for public services | | | | | | | |
| **Output 1.2** | **Municipalities adopt public service improvement mechanisms** | 15. | % of project municipalities have applied SIAP tool to improve at least one priority public service | Project start: Zero point | 100% of the Project municipalities (30) approved SIAP | Municipal SIAPs  Inter-municipal SIAPs | State regulations allow the creation of inter-municipal service delivery models |
| 16. | # of inter-municipal service delivery model established | Project start: Zero point | At least one inter-municipal model for service provision established in each oblast (Issyk-Kul and Jalal-Abad) |
| **Activities per output 1.2. *Municipalities adopt public service improvement mechanisms*** | | | | | | | |
| **List of activities for output 1.2**   * Elaborating training modules for service provision delivery models * Facilitation of establishing municipal SIAP working groups process * Providing trainings to LSGs working groups on suitable model of service provision * Verifying the requests for financial support to SIAP elaboration (1st level of grant) * Providing grant support to SIAPs (2nd level) * Facilitating SIAP realization supervision – financial management of grants, contracting external experts, facilitation of public tender process * Organization of round tables, workshops on inter-municipal cooperation and exchange * Study tour for LSGs members | | | | | | | |
| **For outcome 2: Effective stakeholder interaction system for public service improvements is in place** | | | | | | | |
| **Output 2.1** | **Citizen participation mechanisms in public service definition, execution, and monitoring are established in municipalities** | 17. | % of project municipalities have joint SIAP planning groups established | Project start: Zero point | 100% of the Project municipalities (30) have created SIAP planning groups | Protocols of joint SIAP planning groups  Local council resolutions, citizen survey, announcements on public display boards, papers etc. | Legal framework allowing the practice of citizens’ participation in decision making process in local self-governments exists |
| 18. | % of project municipalities have established a citizens’ request/complaint mechanism | Project start: Zero point | 100% of Project municipalities (30) institutionalized various request/complaint mechanisms |
| 19. | # of services initiated by vulnerable groups (women, marginalized groups and ethnic minorities) and adopted by municipalities | Project start: Zero point | At least one service in 50% of municipalities (15) initiated by vulnerable groups: 1 –Women; 2 – Disabled people; 3 – Poor families; 4 – Ethnic minorities; and adopted by municipalities |
| **Activities per output 2.1. *Citizen participation mechanisms in public service definition, execution, and monitoring are established in municipalities*** | | | | | | | |
| **List of activities for output 2.1**   * Capacity building of local council members on their role and competences in service provision (including legal framework) * Technical assistance to LSGs on municipal mechanisms of citizens’ request/complaints registration and response (citizens score cards, complaint box, info bulletin, info boards) * Support to service priority revision process through focus groups * Technical assistance for LSG to raise their awareness on citizens right and duties (emphasis on gender and social inclusion, pro poor policies and conflict prevention) * Facilitating public hearing session on tariff policy and service quality | | | | | | | |
| **Output 2.2** | **Municipal oversight over public service providers is strengthened** | 20. | # of public service agreements between LSGs and providers with M&E system integrated | Project start: Zero point | At least 60% of the Project municipalities (18) have agreements with service providers holding integrated M&E system | Signed contracts between LSGs and service providers  Protocol of quality control visits, written service provider responses | LSGs are accountable according to legislation for the provision of local services by service providers |
| 21. | % of quality control recommendations from local authorities are implemented by service providers | Project start: Zero point | 80% of recommendations related to contract obligations (service indicators) implemented |
| **Activities per output 2.2. *Municipal oversight over public service providers is strengthened*** | | | | | | | |
| **List of activities for output 2.2:**   * Elaboration of recommendations and trainings for LSGs executive on control of public service agreements * Training for local councils on their competencies in service provision oversight | | | | | | | |
| **Output 2.3** | **Advocacy and information dissemination capacities of municipalities and national counterparts are strengthened** | 22. | # of requests by municipalities formulated and taken up by Union of LSG/SALSGIR | Project start: Zero point | SALSGIR and the Union of LSG process at least two requests per year (totally at least 8 requests in phase 1) | Records of Union of LSG/SALSGIR  Reports of State Personnel Services | The Union of LSGs performs its role on support to initiatives from the LSGs, prescribed in its Charter  SALSGIR performs its role of participating in regulatory framework formulation related to service provision  The Union of LSGs actively cooperates with the project  National program on trainings for the municipal servants available |
| 23. | # regional events on experience sharing organized by Union of LSG/SALSGIR | Project start: Zero point | SALSGIR and the Union of LSG conduct at least two regional events a year (totally at least 8 events in phase 1) |
| 24. | # of regulations on service provision proposed bySALSGIR and other state structures | Project start: Zero point | At least 4 propositions in relation to service provision forwarded to relevant Government agency/parliament |
| 25. | # of municipal servants trained by State Personnel Service | Project start: Zero point | At least one employee from all 484 municipalities (453 Ayil Aimaks and 31 towns) trained by State Personnel Department on services according to the modules developed with the Project support |
| **Activities per output 2.3. *Advocacy and information dissemination capacities of municipalities and national counterparts are strengthened*** | | | | | | | |
| **List of activities for output 2.3:**   * Facilitating the process of interaction between LSGs and governmental bodies by supporting LSG Union and SALSGIR to conduct regional events and activities * Supporting regional advocacy initiatives of municipalities * Technical support to Union of LSGs and SALSGIR in conducting analysis and elaborating and forwarding policy regulations and recommendations * Providing expert support for elaboration of training modules on service provision within national training program for municipal employees * Facilitation of the interaction of LSGs and the Union of LSG with the relevant national training institutions * Supporting annual municipal servants training impact evaluation | | | | | | | |

1. The local policy on service provision – integrated indicator, which includes the following products:

   Local register of services - legal request to LSG to prepare list of services provided by LSG. LSG cannot provide service which is not included into the register of services

   Local community charters with procedures which allow participation of the citizens

   Legal documents which can fix forming and accepting tariffs for services

   Mechanism of recording citizens’ opinion – legal order of recording citizens’ opinion, which include order of forming local register of services and procedures of reacting for citizens’ complains. The PSI will support pilot municipalities in elaboration and adoption of mechanism of recording citizens’ opinion and the local legal acts on the service provision such as Local register of services (including standards). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. „Priority public services “are those services that citizens have defined as highest priority service for their respective municipality. These services may vary by municipalities [↑](#footnote-ref-2)