

## BENCHMARK TABLES

### PURPOSE

The Benchmark tables were designed to track scale-up progress by comparing indicators to pre-set benchmarks. They consist of a summary table, in which changes over time in all indicators may be viewed at a glance, and more detailed tables for each indicator.

### HOW IT WAS DEVELOPED AND USED

As the FAM project began, IRH identified multi-faceted goals of Standard Days Method® (SDM) scale-up and developed simple, measurable indicators for process monitoring. (See the Benchmark Setting Worksheet for a Description of the process.) The indicators were designed to assess both horizontal scale-up (service expansion) and vertical scale-up (institutionalization) elements, and to be applicable to all countries and settings. The five scale-up countries then developed unique benchmarks for each of these indicators using a collaborative approach that involved multiple meetings with MOH officials, other stakeholders, cooperating partners, and the IRH team. The benchmarks for each indicator were targets that the team felt were reasonable and meaningful to achieve within the five-year scale-up period.

A Microsoft Access data base was developed to centralize data collection of these indicators. Twice a year, country staff tabulated the data in Access and reported progress towards benchmarks. At the end of the first year the team evaluated and adjusted the benchmark targets as needed; targets were not revised thereafter. Results allowed tracking of progress

toward the five-year benchmarks throughout the life of the project, and aided staff in determining how to adjust scale-up activities to focus on areas where insufficient progress had been made towards scale-up goals.

The cover sheet of the benchmark table presents a summary of results, which is the most useful table for donors and stakeholders. The tables with indicator details that follow are most useful for those managing the scale-up process. These showed, for example, a list of organizations targeted to become part of the resource team (competent in the innovation), rather than the simply the summary number which appeared on the cover sheet. A system of solid and patterned dots indicated whether the benchmark was not yet achieved, in progress, achieved or achieved and sustained since the last reporting period.

### LESSONS LEARNED

- The benchmark tables were extremely useful for establishing and tracking concrete scale-up goals throughout the scale up process and were referenced frequently by IRH staff in field offices and headquarters.
- Unlike other indicators, indicators that were benchmarking progress toward HMIS and Procurement System integration goals were not standardized. When developed, IRH thought that each country's systems were too unique. In retrospect, it would have been useful to have come to an agreement on how to operationalize these indicators, as this would have allowed for comparisons across countries and facilitated discussions of issues using a common terminology and framework.



- Creating the Access data base was a large undertaking, requiring efforts to meet data needs of all countries while maintaining uniformity. In retrospect, it was not as useful as anticipated. Data was only manipulated at headquarters, and scale-up managers did not use the data to its full potential. Data for the tables can be collected using cheaper, less time-consuming methods; simple Excel spreadsheets are sufficient. For some indicators, the tables can simply be updated as less frequent events occur (for

example, when SDM is added to a new policy), eliminating the need for separate data collection.

### VALUES

The nature of this tool means that it will reflect and allow monitoring of values such as equity of access to SDM services and information, including monitoring SDM integration across public and private sector institutions.

## BENCHMARK TABLES

### Project Progress: Summary Table 1

Project accomplishments toward end of project targets, by project year

#### End of project goals:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

#### Project area population coverage:

Horizontal scale-up	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project
Proportion of <b>SDPs that include METHOD</b> as part of the method mix						
Estimated number of <b>individuals trained</b> to offer METHOD						
Number of <b>organizations that have capacity</b> to undertake method activities						
Vertical scale-up	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Number of essential or <b>key policies</b> , norms, guidelines, and protocols that include the METHOD						
Number of public or private training organizations that include METHOD in <b>pre-service training</b> and/or continuing education						
Number of public or private training organizations that include METHOD in <b>in-service training</b>						
Number of <b>donor procurement systems</b> that sustainably include the METHOD system						
Number of <b>logistics systems</b> that include METHOD commodity						
Number of <b>HMIS/reporting systems</b> that include METHOD						
Number of <b>IEC activities</b> that include METHOD						
# of surveys including METHOD						



### Benchmark Tables Detailed Results

**Key:**

- **Initiated:** Began discussions with organizations/donors or began advocacy for inclusion.
- **In progress:** new item working on for that year, or item continues to be worked on (e.g., guideline carried over from year to year), or item included but not correctly and needs updates or revision.
- **Correctly included**
- **Maintenance:** Continued monitoring and support to ensure sustainability

**Horizontal scale-up**

Proportion of SDPs that include METHOD as part of the method mix	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Include METHOD (cumulative % from End of Project target n)						
<b>Comments:</b>						

Estimated number of individuals trained to offer METHOD	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Female						
Male						
Total (cumulative)						
<b>Comments:</b>						

Estimated number of individuals trained to offer METHOD	Year 1**	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Facility based						
Community based						
Total (cumulative)						
<b>Comments:</b>						



Number of <b>organizations that have capacity</b> to undertake method activities	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Organization name						
Organization name						
Organization name						
Total (cumulative)						
<b>Comments:</b>						

### Vertical scale-up

Number of essential or <b>key policies</b> , norms, guidelines, and protocols that include the METHOD	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Policy						
Norm						
Guideline						
Protocol						
Total						
<b>Comments:</b>						

Number of public or private training organizations that include METHOD in <b>pre-service training</b> and/or continuing education	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Organization name						
Organization name						
Organization name						
Total						
<b>Comments:</b>						



Number of public or private training organizations that include METHOD in in-service training	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Organization name						
Organization name						
Organization name						
Total						
<b>Comments:</b>						

Number of donor procurement systems that sustainably include the METHOD system	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
System name						
System name						
System name						
Total						
<b>Comments:</b>						

Number of logistics systems that include METHOD commodity	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
System name						
System name						
System name						
Total						
<b>Comments:</b>						



Number of HMIS/reporting systems that include METHOD	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
System name						
System name						
System name						
Total						
<b>Comments:</b>						

Number of IEC activities that include METHOD	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Activity name						
Activity name						
Activity name						
Total						
<b>Comments:</b>						

# of surveys including METHOD	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	End of project target (n)
Survey name						
Survey name						
Survey name						
Total						
<b>Comments:</b>						