

Real world strategies: Developing campaigning skills to influence education policy and practice

A funding proposal submitted by the Global
Campaign for Education, ANCEFA and ASPBAE

*Contact person: Anne Jellema, GCE Advocacy Coordinator, PO Box 18, Kalk Bay 7990, RSA Tel:
+27 21 788 6783 or +27 84 359 4800. Email: anne@campaignforeducation.org*

Summary

This three-year project is a partnership between three regional and international networks for education advocacy – the GCE, ASPBAE and ANCEFA - and their members in 20 countries. Civil society networks often try to organize their advocacy work around a ‘mission statement’ setting out very broad, general goals; or, at the opposite extreme, an ‘activity plan’ that is detailed and practical, but has little overall strategic direction. In both cases, lack of clearly defined goals makes intelligent monitoring of impact impossible. Weak strategic planning, a failure to link the national with the regional and international policy arenas, and poor or non-existent evaluation all help to explain why even an energetic schedule of influencing activities often produces little actual change in policy or practice. This project will assist civil society groups to design, agree, implement and monitor a well-informed, targeted and time-limited strategy for achieving specific and measurable changes in national education policy and financing. Its premise is that better-focused advocacy work will have a greater impact on government actions, which in turn will help to accelerate progress towards the Education for All goals.

The project cost is approximately USD \$935,000 spread over three years. USD \$665,000 is requested from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs while the remainder has been requested from the Commonwealth Education Fund .

Real world strategies: developing campaigning skills to influence education policy and practice

A funding proposal submitted by the Global Campaign for Education, ANCEFA and ASPBAE

I Background and rationale

In many of the countries currently “off-track” for achieving the Education for All goals, public education systems have sunk into a vicious circle of inadequate investment and inefficient management, which condemns poor children to a dismally inferior education or none at all. Lack of public scrutiny further weakens quality and accountability. This cycle can only be broken if citizens exercise their rights as voters and taxpayers to demand better schools for all. Civil society groups have a vital role in building public pressure for education reform. Moreover, as advocates for the poor and marginalised, it is their responsibility to translate popular demands into detailed recommendations for the resource allocations, policies and management systems needed – locally, nationally, and internationally - to make schools work.

In 1999, the Global Campaign for Education began to galvanise civil society organisations to take up the stance of advocates, activists and watchdogs rather than simply delivering services. As an alliance of teachers’ unions, international NGOs, local NGOs and child rights networks, the GCE seeks to hold governments and international institutions accountable for delivering on the Education for All goals agreed at Jomtien in 1990 and reaffirmed in Dakar in 2000. The GCE and the regional networks active within in the GCE have been successful in building a sustained and cohesive civil society input to EFA processes at regional and international level, and through the annual Global Week of Action in April we have mobilised an increasing number of community groups, parents and teachers around the world to demand implementation of the Dakar commitments.

Over the past two to three years national groups active in the GCE and associated regional networks have also begun systematic and coordinated lobby efforts in order to persuade their own governments to adopt reforms. We recognise that this is the most critical dimension of our campaigning effort, and we have therefore consulted widely with members to determine how to increase impact at the national level. This consultation shows that much work needs to be done. Few groups have defined what specific policy changes they are trying to achieve or have related them to the resource allocation choices that governments and donors must make. Engagement in mainstream processes such as PRSPs and sector planning is still marginal while on the other hand some groups have misdirected considerable energy into influencing parallel “EFA Plans” that have little impact on government and donor priorities. Few groups have developed a strategy for marshalling their own limited resources and political capital to mobilise popular support and leverage maximum influence. Important sectors of civil society, such as the private sector, teachers’ unions and NGOs, may still be working in isolation from one another. National level actions are seldom “joined up” at the subregional or regional level and links to the international policy arena are weak.

The campaign planning process has been designed to provide structured facilitation and support to civil society groups wishing to improve the focus, coherence and creativity of their advocacy efforts. It will assist civil society groups to design, agree, implement and monitor a well-informed, targeted and time-limited strategy for achieving specific and measurable

changes in national education policy and financing as well as in international development partner policies affecting the education sector. Its premise is that better-focused advocacy work will have a greater impact on government actions, which in turn will help to accelerate progress towards the Education for All goals.

II Goals and measures of success

- 1) The breadth, strength and depth of civil society organisation around shared change goals will increase
 - a. Common platforms for education advocacy, appropriate to local political conditions, will be established in countries where these do not already exist
 - b. New actors will join the common platform – e.g. teachers’ unions, youth movements, women’s groups, chamber of commerce, etc.
 - c. Coordination and communication mechanisms will be strengthened, leading to better orchestrated and timed interventions.

- 2) Coalitions will develop and implement focused strategic plans, leading to appreciably increased public awareness of the issues, and ultimately to greater impact on policy outcomes nationally and internationally
 - a. By the midpoint of the programme, each participating coalition will have set itself no more than three achievable short-term change objectives, linked to a coherent longer-term campaign strategy.
 - b. Change objectives will reflect a well-informed strategy for engaging with major international or regional processes or actors that impact on the national policy context
 - c. By the end of the programme, each coalition should have achieved at least one of its short-term objectives.

- 3) A new approach to building advocacy capacity will be tested

Our approach will organise advocacy learning around the collective production of a real-world “game plan”: an intelligently targeted, realistic, but inventive step-by-step strategy for changing policy *over a limited period of time* and with a *limited amount of resources*. This approach will be successful if:

- a. Campaign plans developed in the strategy workshops are taken forward by the coalition as a whole, and are reflected in an agreed workplan strategy and budget which has the ownership and support of coalition members;
 - b. Fresh approaches to advocacy work are invented in the strategy workshop and subsequently incorporated into the coalition’s workplan and budget.
 - c. The strategic priorities chosen by the coalition inform future demands for “capacity-building”, with a focus on acquiring knowledge and skills directly necessary for the successful implementation of the strategy.
- 4) The documentation, monitoring and evaluation of advocacy efforts will improve

Advocacy involves a great number of variables that cannot be directly controlled, or even predicted, by those doing the work, and therefore assessing advocacy impact requires a different set of tools and concepts than those typically used to monitor project operations. However, good monitoring is crucial in enabling activists to judge whether the right targets

and tactics have been selected to achieve the goals that have been set, and whether the workplan is appropriate to the level of resources and time available. Once a campaign plan is agreed, a workshop focusing on monitoring and evaluation issues will take place, and monitoring procedures will be agreed. As a result:

- a. Each national campaign plan will include a set of measurable benchmarks or milestones that can be used to gauge progress.
- b. Coalitions will have a detailed analysis of which objectives they have succeeded in achieving and which they have not and why.
- c. Coalitions will be able to show how they have modified their strategy in response to failures (or unexpected successes).
- d. The information collected through agreed monitoring procedures will result in specific problems being identified, and will be reflected in improvements to the campaign plan.

III Approach and methodology

3.1 A real-world approach

Conventional approaches to “advocacy training” break “advocacy” into an abstract bundle of discrete “skills”. This may expose participants to new concepts but cannot catalyse a process of strategic planning and coalition-building. As membership-based organisations with the mandate to advance and support the advocacy interests of national civil society, GCE, ANCEFA and ASPBAE are able to adopt a different approach to capacity-building. We aim to facilitate a ‘real’ process of planning a national campaign, rather than simply taking participants through simulations and hypothetical exercises. Over an 18-month period, local and international mentors will help to guide a broad range of civil society actors through a process of structured analysis and dialogue, using ideas and experiences from other contexts in order to sharpen and refine their own analysis of advocacy challenges and opportunities (including opportunities to influence national governments through interventions in the regional and international arenas). Crucial in this process will be the concept of a “campaign” – a focused and systematic effort that seeks to orchestrate the actions of diverse players in order to achieve measurable impacts within a relatively short period of time. By the end of this period, key subsectors of civil society will have agreed on a specific, time-bound and achievable campaign goal; mapped out a multi-faceted strategy and a division of tasks for getting there; developed gender-responsive indicators and assessment techniques for monitoring whether the strategy is generating the desired impacts; and revised their strategy at least once after reviewing the first four to six months of implementation.

The project will be demand-driven and each national coalition will design its own capacity-building programme with assistance from the regional project managers and other expert resource persons, including a campaigns mentor with diverse international experience. However, the project managers will be responsible for ensuring cumulative cross-learning from the national capacity-building programmes in Africa and Asia. Possible outputs include the production of training materials and modules and tools for planning and evaluating advocacy work that can be easily adapted by other groups, as well as a database of trainers and resource persons from each region.

3.2 Responding to the specificity of country situations

In the effort to create an effective voice for civil society in policy formulation, three fundamental hurdles must be passed:

1. Building a shared understanding of advocacy as a legitimate and important task for civil society and rallying a broad cross-section of civil society around some common goals
2. Establishing credibility in the eyes of government, media and other opinion-formers
3. Marshalling evidence, arguments and political support as part of a systematic strategy to influence policy

In many countries, the first and second challenges have been largely overcome. In these countries, broad national networks already exist, bringing together a range of local and international NGOs as well as unions, faith-based groups and other associations. They have acted as knowledge conduits and clearing-houses, raising awareness of the Dakar goals and processes; carrying out basic analysis of the challenges facing the country in seeking to meet these goals (assessing, for example, the allocation of resources to basic education, and seeking to pinpoint who is out of school and why); and sharing information about the role of civil society in ensuring that these challenges are overcome. These efforts have in most instances established them as credible and constructive actors in the eyes of Ministries of Education. Although barriers to full participation still remain, many of these coalitions have been able to claim a place at the table in government policy and planning processes (for example in EFA forums, PRSPs and education sector plans). The main challenge they now face is how to make more effective use of the openings for influencing that have been created.

Therefore, in countries with already-established platforms for joint civil society action, the work will focus on translating credibility and cohesion into actual policy impact. At the same time, the strategic planning process will help to identify and resolve any persistent weaknesses in the first two areas (for example, many national networks still do not include teachers' unions as active members and many governments remain reluctant to accommodate full civil society participation).

In these countries, experienced campaigners (drawn from within the same country or subregion as much as possible) will work intensively with coalitions, demonstrating strategising techniques for transforming a laundry list of "issues" into a priority list of achievable change goals, acquiring enough information to make intelligent strategic choices, and mapping out a time-bound game plan and measurable short-term objectives. During a period of implementing these strategic plans, we will focus on assisting coalitions to develop and apply gender-responsive advocacy monitoring skills and to use the lessons learned to further refine and expand both their analysis of policy options and their strategies for influencing the policymaking process. We estimate that about half of the participating countries will fall into this group.

By contrast, in other countries, civil society remains fragmented or even divided, and most groups involved in education practice have very little engagement in or information about issues of education policy. Moreover, because there has been no organised and systematic civil society effort to claim a place at the table, Ministries of Education in these countries typically refuse to involve civil society in planning or in policy discussions. In these countries, we envision a process of sharing information, building alliances, identifying common goals and looking for openings to increase participation, which may take 12 to 18 months. Once stakeholders decide that a strong enough foundation for collective action has been established, a campaign planning process can be initiated.

In these “non-coalition countries” we will work with key actors to explore different models of collective action by civil groups (formal coalition, loose network, ad hoc pressure group, etc.) and what each model needs in order to succeed (including issues of governance, funding, transparency and accountability). Developing a better understanding of how different types of organisation work and what their constraints and strengths are - for example, churches, trade unions, international NGOs, local NGOs, the private sector, government ministries, parliament, local government – would also be an important aspect of this phase of work, as would the introduction of gender analysis tools. Individuals with experience of successful civil society networks in the same subregion or region would be drawn in as resource persons.

In all countries, there will be a strong focus on sharing experiences and skills within regions, and individuals who have been key players in developing and implementing successful campaigns will be asked to act as resource persons in other countries within their region.

3.3 Coordination and complementarity with other capacity-building initiatives

Our project is not intended to cover *all* of the training needs that networks face. Rather, it is designed to complement other capacity-building efforts – such as the work being funded by the Norwegian Trust Fund with teachers’ unions in several “Fast Track” countries, the training programme being planned by the UNESCO Collective Consultation of NGOs, or the national efforts being supported through the Commonwealth Education Fund. The outcomes of the strategic planning process will provide a natural jumping-off point for other capacity-building efforts, which can provide opportunities to deepen knowledge of education “content” issues relevant to the change goals established in the plan, or to acquire more sophisticated skills in particular advocacy areas (media training, research, budget advocacy). Moreover, a focused campaign plan will actually assist national groups to make far more effective use of the many training opportunities on offer. Once in possession of a basic strategy and timeline for changing policy on adult education, civil society groups will be far more likely to take forward the insights and knowledge gained in a three day workshop on scaling up innovative literacy projects. Moreover, the campaign planning process itself would provide an opportunity to apply new insights, contacts and ideas gained from such a workshop in order to revise, elaborate and sharpen their advocacy plan.

However, the campaign planning process will not omit basic analysis of the policy context. A campaign strategy is only as good as the analysis that informs it. A certain amount of work will be needed to develop the information base needed to choose sufficiently specific and realistic change objectives and identify the levers that could be used to achieve the desired changes. Most of the content work will be done with local experts as resource people/trainers. National convenors will work with regional coordinators to identify appropriate experts. For example, if Network X decides that girls’ education is a top priority, the national convenor’s first task would be to find out whether anyone has already carried out an audit of the barriers to girls’ education in country X and the gender impact of existing policies and legislation, which could be shared with the group.

In all cases, regional coordinators will do their best to match networks’ needs with existing training opportunities, rather than duplicating the efforts of other organisations. For example, if Network X decides it needs skills in assessing the gender impact of education policies and budgets, the first task of the regional coordinator would be to find out whether relevant training workshops or capacity development programmes may already be planned or contemplated by GCE member organisations and other NGOs and funders, and whether the organisers of these trainings could accommodate the needs of the Country X group.

3.4 Criteria for selecting countries

1. Either a credible and representative civil society platform on education must already exist or several major players in the sector must have expressed a strong will to form one.
2. Local groups must have identified capacity-building on education policy advocacy as a major priority and it is judged that the involvement of an international campaign network could add value in helping to catalyse and facilitate this process.
3. Countries furthest off-track for meeting the 2015 and 2005 goals will be given preference.
4. An ASPBAE/ANCEFA/GCE member organisation must be interested and willing to coordinate the process at national level, and there must be strong commitment to actual implementation of campaign plans.
5. At least 2/3 of the countries should be taken from the Fast Track Initiative pilot countries and/or UNICEF priority countries for accelerating progress on girls' education.

As this is a demand-driven project, it is not possible to decide in advance what countries will be included. Expressions of interest to join the project would be invited from *all* members of the GCE, ANCEFA and ASPBAE networks and would be evaluated by the Steering Committee (see below) against the above criteria. However, preliminary discussions have produced the following list of priority countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, and Zambia.

4. Management and implementation

A *project steering committee*, consisting of the advocacy coordinators of ANCEFA, ASPBAE and GCE, and a representative of the GCE Board, would be formed to oversee the implementation of the project, to ensure financial probity and to recruit and provide guidance to staff. The steering committee would be responsible for ensuring that the content and methodology of the capacity-building workshops are consistent with core principles of ANCEFA, ASPBAE and GCE, including our commitment to objectivity, cost-effectiveness and professionalism in all aspects of our work, our rights-based approach and our strong conviction that education must promote social justice and equity, including gender equity.

A **four-person team** – three regional coordinators (one full-time post in Africa and two part-time posts in South Asia and the South Pacific, respectively) and an international campaign mentor - would be recruited. This team *would not deliver* training to the participating coalitions, but would rather provide them with support, advice, ideas, contacts and in some cases materials and tools so that they can develop good quality, effective training programmes themselves.

The **regional coordinators** would be co-managers of the project (draft job description attached as appendix 2). Based in the two regional networks (ASPBAE and ANCEFA), they would work closely with those responsible for planning and facilitating training workshops in each country. They would be directly managed by the regional network, but would report to the project steering committee. They would assist these national training convenors to match the interests and needs of participants to the appropriate choice of possible facilitators, inputs and methods. They would help to plan the agenda, identify local resource persons, and

develop training materials. They would attend as many workshops as possible and could lead some sessions on the agenda, but this would not be their primary role. The **regional coordinator** would also be responsible for compiling a database of trainers and resource persons and maintaining a clearinghouse of relevant capacity-building programmes and initiatives that could potentially meet further training needs identified during the strategic planning process.

In addition, an expert resource person, reporting to the steering committee and directly managed by the GCE coordinator, would be contracted to act as ‘**campaign mentor**’ on a part-time consultancy basis to provide specialist advice and training support to the national coalitions. This would be someone with excellent facilitation skills, an understanding of how national and international processes and structures interact to shape the policy context, and a proven track record of successful campaigns and advocacy work in a variety of situations. Together with the regional coordinators, she or he would be responsible for translating the project’s “real world” approach into specific tools, materials and resources for the planning and monitoring of education advocacy. See Appendix 3 for a job description.

Each participating national network/coalition will be expected to *second* a part-time **national convenor** to organise and prepare the workshops and ensure follow-through in liaison with the regional coordinator. This person should be someone already actively involved in the national network’s activities. Where no network is in place, the regional coordinator will consult the existing GCE/ANCEFA/ASPBAE partners in the country and seek to get their agreement on an appropriate secondment. The national convenor’s regular employer would be reimbursed for the time dedicated to this project (approximately four weeks’ work per year), assuming satisfactory completion of tasks defined in a terms of reference to be agreed between the national network and the regional coordinator. He or she will report to the regional coordinator.

4.1 Reporting and financial management (to be agreed with funding agencies)

The contract for this project will be between the Government of the Netherlands and Novib (on behalf of GCE). Novib will disburse funds to ANCEFA and ASPBAE for regional staffing and administration, regional planning meetings and national workshops within their region; these two organisations will take responsibility for transfers to national level organisations within their region. GCE staff and management costs (including payments to international campaign mentors and the costs of the international evaluation meeting in Year 3) will be disbursed by Novib on GCE’s behalf. GCE will submit to the Netherlands a brief midyear report indicating what activities have been carried out and how much has been spent. On this basis GCE will also make its request for the next six months of funding. At the end of every calendar year GCE will submit to the Netherlands government a full progress report that includes complete accounts audited by a well-known firm.

V Timeline and workplan

Due to the large number of countries interested in participating and the intensive nature of the support being provided, we will follow a rolling timeline. The process will last about 18 months in every country but different countries will begin the process at different times, so that it will take a total of 36 months to cover all countries.

Months 1-2: Pre-planning – small group meets to plan the strategic brainstorming, identify topics where outside input will be needed. Should happen as soon as a network commits to joining the programme, not wait for funding approval.

Month 2-3: Guided strategic brainstorming – 3 days. Identify priority issues, past successes to build on, goal for next six months, what needs to happen by when.

Month 3-4: National convenor prepares or revises plan and budget based on strategic outline (with assistance from regional manager if needed). By the end of month 3 of the programme, all participating countries should have a strategy and a plan and budget for implementing it.

Months 5-10 (leading into Action Week 2003): Implementation of 6 month plan

Networks can commission additional goal-driven inputs & peer support from local/regional/international experts, designed to help attain 6-month goal. Task of regional managers is to match their needs to a menu of available training resources, drawing extensively on activities and expertise available within the GCE network.

Months 11-12: Assessment (1-2 days) and forward planning (1-2 days) with peer support

Midway into the implementation of these strategic plans, coalitions will come together again to assess the impact of their advocacy interventions. Issues such as gender and class bias in advocacy choices will be raised through participants' own reflections on how they made decisions about priorities and tactics – were urban concerns favoured over rural issues, for example, and if so, was this a justifiable strategic choice or does it reflect the relative weakness of small grassroots groups within the wider coalition? Participants will apply the lessons learned to further refine and expand both their *analysis* of policy options and their *strategies* for influencing the policymaking process.

Month 11: regional or international workshop for national convenors to evaluate training approach, capture successful methods and tools, discuss opportunities for more effective regional and international collaboration on shared advocacy issues

Months 13-14: production of final outputs for others to use

Month 18: Final assessment

In addition to this, three months should be set aside at the start of the project (Nov 2002 – Jan 2003) for recruitment and planning, and two months at the end (Oct – Nov 2006) for an overall assessment and production of materials.

Note that another group of countries could begin the training cycle at any point during months 3-14, i.e. once the initial wave of strategic plans has been produced.

APPENDIX ONE: DRAFT BUDGET (USD)

ITEM	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	TOTAL
STAFF COSTS				
Regional coordinators (p/t) x 2 in Asia	12,000	13,200	14,520	39,720
Regional coordinator in Africa	15,000	16,500	18,150	49,650
Campaign mentors (p/t) @ USD200 per day.	35,000 (175 days @ USD 200)	27,500 (125 days @ USD 220)	12,100 (50 days @ USD 242)	74,600
National convenors – 4 weeks per year @175 per week	14,000	15,400	16,940	46,340
Subtotal	76,000	72,600	61,710	210,310
TRAVEL				
Travel for above posts (3 visits per country from team members over project lifecycle @ USD1000 each)	20,000	20,000	20,000	60,000
Subtotal	20,000	20,000	20,000	60,000
ADMINISTRATION				
Office costs (phone, internet, photocopying, supplies) – South Asia	2,000	2,200	2420	6620
Office costs – South Pacific	3,200	3520	3872	10,592
Office costs - Africa	4,500	4,950	5445	14,895
Part-time administrative and accounting support based in GCE Cape Town office	10,000	11,000	12,100	33,100
Coordinating organisations' management expenses	15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000
Subtotal	34,700	36,670	38,837	110,207
WORKSHOPS				
Workshop costs: 4 per country over project lifecycle, @ 4500 USD per workshop	60,000	60,000	60,000	180,000
Workshops for CEF-funded coalitions @ 50% of 4500 USD per workshop	30,000	30,000	30,000	90,000
Workshop documentation and materials production, translation and dissemination	10,000	11,000	12,100	33,100
National or regional training budgets for local consultants and resource persons @ USD 1000 per country	20,000	20,000	20,000	60,000
Regional planning and evaluation – Africa	35,000	35,000		70,000
Regional planning – Asia	35,000	35,000		70,000
International evaluation workshop			45,000	45,000
Subtotal	190,000	191,000	167,100	548,100
EQUIPMENT				
Laptop computers for regional coordinators	6000	0	0	6000
Subtotal	6000	0	0	6000
ANNUAL TOTALS	326,700	320,270	287,647	934,617

Notes on the Budget

- 1) Ten percent inflation has been assumed on salaries and consultancy fees, office costs and materials production. This will be adjusted to reflect real inflation trends in the relevant countries.
- 2) Budget for regional meetings may be split into subregional meetings depending on the preference of the regional partner and participating national coalitions.
- 3) In countries that do not yet have a functioning coalition, the national convenor role may not be needed until year 2 or even year 3 of the project.

Appendix 2: Job Description for Regional Coordinators

Regional partners (ASPBAE and ANCEFA) will provide programmatic and administrative support to the Regional Coordinators in South and South East Asia, South Pacific and Africa. This will include managing disbursement and financial reporting to national coalitions/partners, providing secretarial support especially when organising regional or subregional meetings, handling personnel matters (contracts, tax, etc.) and providing management support and supervision.

There will not be a regional coordinator in Latin America; instead, the two countries in Latin America will liaise directly with the international campaign mentor and GCE secretariat and the national convenor role will be expanded to 8 weeks per year instead of 4 per year as in the other regions.

- Assist GCE and regional partner in selecting countries to be included in the programme based on agreed criteria. This will mainly involve further investigation/inquiry if we do not have sufficient information to make decisions, or require validation of what is already known.
- With GCE and regional partner, identify appropriate national partner(s) for the strategic planning process and identify and agree terms of reference for a national convenor.
- With national partner, carry out an advocacy skills audit and develop a unique capacity-building programme appropriate to each country. This would involve a series of discussions and consultations, to which the regional coordinator would be expected to bring regional and global perspectives on advocacy opportunities and challenges affecting national policy contexts.
- With the international campaign mentor, assist national partners to plan and develop tools and materials for the capacity-building programme; this would also include identifying resource persons, accessing learning materials produced by other organisations, and sharing tools and methods developed in other countries involved in this project.
- With the international campaign mentor, develop a data base of resource persons, learning materials and training programmes that can be harnessed and mobilised by national coalitions, both for this process and for future training needs.
- Participate in at least two workshops in each of the countries in her own region, and observe and help to evaluate at least one workshop per year in another region.
- With the international mentor, develop the mechanism/framework for evaluating the effectiveness of the trainings conducted and support provided, and recommend strategies for subsequent capacity-building activities.

APPENDIX 3: Terms of Reference for International Campaign Mentors

Appendix 4: Logical Framework

(separate file attached)